

A N
E S S A Y

Towards *ascertaining*

The Sense of the Much-controverted Passage,

I N

St. Peter's Second Epistle,

F R O M

The 16th Verse to the End of the
First Chapter,

B Y A

CRITICAL DISCUSSION of the Whole;

In a LETTER to a MAN of QUALITY:

In the Course of which the LORD BISHOP OF
LONDON's Comparison of the MORE SURE
Word of Prophecy, &c. is defended, against
the Objections made to it by the Reverend
Messieurs *Ashton* and *Cooke*, Fellows of *Eton*
College; and their *several Solutions* are *examin'd*:

W I T H

An APPENDIX, relating to the *Difference* between
Moses and *other Prophets* in the xiith Chapter of the
Book of *Numbers*; the *Gradius Mosaiscus* of the *Jews*;
and the Prophecy concerning ANOTHER Prophet, in
the xviiiith Chapter of *Deuteronomy*.

By a late FELLOW-COMMONER of *St. John's*
College, Cambridge.

L O N D O N:

Printed for J. and J. RIVINGTON, at the *Bible and*
Crown in *St. Paul's Church-yard*. M.DCC.LI.

ESSAY

The History of the Massachusetts Bay

By Peter's Second Epistle

The first part of the History of the

Massachusetts Bay

Is the History of the

Massachusetts Bay

Massachusetts Bay

Massachusetts Bay

Massachusetts Bay

Massachusetts Bay

Massachusetts Bay

Massachusetts Bay

Massachusetts Bay

E

2

M

I

to

this

ing

doing

in di

differe

any

sure,

And

been

Lord

and

force

much

less

see.

[2]
AN
ESSAY
ON

2 P. B. T. Chap. i. Ver. 16, &c.

My LORD,

I MUST own, indeed, that I am indebted to your Lordship, as I have not made Use, this Summer, of your kind Invitation into —some Account how I have been spending my Time. Why, truly, my Lord, in doing as you People of Taste generally do; in diversifying the Scene; tho' from a very different Motive. Would *Business* have in any wise allow'd it, the Enchantress, *Pleasure*, would certainly have drawn me to —: And you will easily see how much I have been kept out of *her* Way, as well as *your Lordship's*, when I tell you, that great Pain, and above a Month's Confinement, have forced me to my usual Shift, of making much of my Time, in order to make the less of my Pain: The Effect is what you see. *Curiosity* has its Dangers, as well as

B

its

its Gratifications ; and, lo ! my Lord, instead of a *Letter*, a *Book*, which your Lordship, you know, is, in Honour, oblig'd to read.

But why a Subject of *Divinity* to a *Man* of *Quality* ? There is no Absurdity in this, my Lord, to *You*. But besides *Divinity*, 'tis that which, during our Acquaintance at *Cambridge*, so much engag'd your Attention, till Affairs drew it off, *Criticism* ; and with what *Diligence* and *Success* you paid your Court to her, the World would have seen, could your invincible Modesty have been prevail'd on to suffer your *Lælius* and *Cato Major* to have seen the Light.

Tho' I had long conceiv'd an Indignation against so sacred a Thing as Scripture being prostituted to the idle vague Method of *Conjectural Interpretation* ; yet the Occasion of my Thoughts being determin'd to this particular Subject at that Time, was purely Accident : I had just then been reading over, with all the Attention I shall ever think due to whatever comes from so learned a Seminary, Mr. *Ashton's Dissertation* on the much-controverted Passage in *St. Peter*, and Mr. *Cook's Sermon* on the same Subject. But, tho' I was greatly entertain'd with the

Inge-

Ingenuity, with the Perspicuity and Gaiety of
 Stile of Mr. *Ashton*, and Mr. *Cooke's* good
 Sense and Modesty, and terse Expression,
 charm'd me; yet my Sentiments of the
Justness of the Comparison which these Gen-
 tlemen are dissatisfied with, remain'd the
 same as before, and I found myself con-
 vinced of nothing new, but of the Necessity
 of trying, if the Sense of this Passage could
 be ascertain'd by the Rules of Criticism.
 'Tis something extraordinary, that, within a
 very little Time, we should have, from the
 same learned Body, two Explications of this
 Passage, both differing from my Lord of
London's, and each from one another: And
 as this seems to proceed from different Men
considering a Thing in different Lights, as
 they happen to see it, and the different
 Lights in which it may be consider'd are
 many; 'tis very possible that we may, in a
 little Time more, have *twenty* instead of
two, and the Passage be thereby involv'd in
 Difficulties *not its own*, and the true Sense
 lost in the *Confusion* of Explications. This,
 my Lord, determin'd me to the slow and
 tedious, tho' the only sure, Way of *critical*
Examination: The Result is, that, by read-
 ing

ing what has been wrote against his Lordship's *Comparison* of the more sure Word of Prophecy, I am the more convinced of the Truth of it; having, by these means, been lead into a closer and stricter Examination into the Import of some of the Terms, and the Connexion and Dependence of the Whole. As your Lordship knows enough of me to be satisfied, that I *can* make no Sacrifice of *Truth* to Views of *Interest*, or to a *great Name*; so do I enough of myself to be well assur'd, that no low Motive of *Envy* has had any Influence on the Occasion: I could with as full Complacency have given either Mr. *Cooke* or Mr. *Ashton* Joy of his Discovery, as have acquiesced in the Comparison of *my Lord Bishop of London*.

But, before I *enter* into the Subject, your Lordship must allow me an Observation or two, that we may know the better how it is *circumstanced*.

In the first Place, then, the *Genuineness* of the Second Epistle of St. *Peter* is, in the whole Dispute, a Point admitted: Mr. *Collins*, and Dr. *Middleton*, when they urge the Authority of St. *Peter* from it, *suppose* it: Mr. *Cook*, and Mr. *Ashton*, *really* allow it.

And,

And, indeed, if it be not *Peter's the Apostle*, that it is not *another Peter's*, but a design'd Imposture, is evident, from this Text, as well as from the Address before, in the Beginning of the Epistle; and what follows after, in the Beginning of the third Chapter.

I must, in the next Place, observe, that the present Question is not a Question between *Believers* and *Unbelievers*, but between Believers themselves. The Gentlemen of *Eton* are agreed with the Bishop, in making *the more sure Word of Prophecy* to relate not to the *Evidences of Christianity* in general, but to the *Power and Coming* of the Lord *Jesus Christ*; to a Thing *future*, and not *past*: And this has been so fully prov'd by them all, that if I was to meet with an Unbeliever, who had read them, I had almost said St. *Peter* himself, with Attention, without any Comment or Explanation; and yet should still contend, that here was a Comparison made between Prophecy and Miracles *in general, as Evidences of Christ's Mission*; I should really think all farther Reasoning or Argument thrown away on him. But be this as it will; this is not, at present, the Point in Question: The Business, now, is not

to prove that this is ^{at} *not* the Sense of the Words; but to ascertain, if we can, *what is*. Should we fail in the Attempt, Infidelity, however, can draw no Advantages from the Failure; for if it has been fully shewn, that any Sense, which the Leaders of that Cause have adopted, in order to serve the Interests of it, is not, nor cannot be, the true Sense, they have nothing farther to do in this Matter: Whatever *may* be, 'tis sufficient that theirs *is* not; and if theirs be not the true Sense, all the Advantages, built on it, must fall with the Foundation on which they are built. My Design, in mentioning this, is, not only to obviate any Advantages which our Enemies may pretend to draw from our Disagreement among ourselves, but to observe how absurd *Acrimony*, mix'd with such Disagreement, would be; as the Whole is no more than a *Discussion between Friends*; and none of those stimulating Ideas, which are apt to warm good Men, when they are writing against the Enemies of their Religion, into a Heat more natural than beneficial to their Cause, can have Place here: If any thing of that kind should shew itself, 'tis plain it cannot proceed from a Concern

for

for the *Publick*, but *Ourselves*. Should you catch me, therefore, at this, *Ex ore meo*—

But tho' the present Inquiry be such as does not regard the Essentials of Christianity, yet it cannot but draw the Notice of all, whose Attention, either by their Profession, or Inclination, is engaged in sacred Literature. In sacred, as well as other Literature, 'tis not so much *the Necessary*, as *the Difficult*, that interests the Curious; and this, indeed, with more Reason than on first Sight appears: For *one* is generally trite and common, and has no need of farther Inquiry; in the *other* there still remains something either not sufficiently discover'd, or sufficiently settled; and in such a Case an inquisitive Mind cannot be satisfy'd, till this either is done, or it sees that it cannot be done. Especially when a Question of this kind happens to be much ventilated, and grow into great Debate. Now both these Things concur in the present Subject: The *Difficulty* of the Passage, the different Explanations of so many eminent Men too plainly shew; and you see how *complicated the Debate grows*.

Whatever Difficulties there are in any Passage, they must lie either in the *Subject*, or the *Expression*; and in the latter, again, either in the *Terms*, or the *Construction*. 'Tis the latter, too, that is *first in the Order of Inquiry*; for if the Place can be eclaircis'd, by eclaircising the Expression, the Business is done: 'Tis plain the Difficulty lies not in the Subject. With regard to the Expression, its Difficulties generally arise either from the *Terms having different Meanings*, or the *Sentences being capable of different References*; or from *particular Allusions*; or from the Writer's using Terms in a *vague indeterminate Manner*, when he does not understand well the Meaning of the Word, or his own Meaning. And here the *first* of these three is to be the *first in the Inquiry*. The Rule to be observ'd is obvious; That *where-ever the Terms have various Meanings, and the Sentences may be differently referr'd, that is plainly to be chosen, which is most consistent with the Design of the whole Passage, and all that it has relation to.* If we can get at the *End and Design*, that will afford us a good Clue, thro' the Labyrinth of various Senses, and uncertain Constructions;

shew

show us what is *consistent*, what not; the Business will then be reduced to the *Fitness of Means*, in order to an *End*: And as the End is that by which the *Fitness* is to be measur'd; the first regular Step towards ascertaining, seems to be the ascertaining this Measure.

In this Manner, therefore, we will, if you please, my Lord, enter into the Discussion: If the Passage *can*, by these Means, be ascertain'd, well and good; if not, it must be left to its *native Obscurity*: But whether it can, or cannot, is to be known only by *the Trial*.

'Tis evident, that as *Words* make *Sentences*; *Sentences* *Periods*; and *Periods* a Something for which we have not, I think, a proper Name in *English*, a kind of *Whole*, where all the Parts have an immediate Connexion with one another, and which is connected itself with the rest of the Discourse as a Part of *another Whole*; 'tis from the *Design*, in particular, of *this lesser Whole*, that all the Parts of it must derive their full Light, as this Design sometimes may, from the *general Design* and *Intention of the whole Piece*.

The

The lesser Whole, or the immediate Context, if you please, in the Case before us, is the six Verses from the sixteenth Verse to the End of the first Chapter of the Second Epistle, where the Transition is to the false Teachers among *Christians*; all the Parts of which, you will, on the Perusal of it here transcrib'd, see bound together in *one Connection*, and the Whole connected by the *that* introduces it to the *preceding Context*. If the Design of this *immediate Context* can be ascertain'd, 'twill be readily allow'd, that *That Sense of Terms, and Reference of Sentences, which is most agreeable to it, is the true Sense*; provided it does not clash with the *Analogy of Faith*, or is not inconsistent with the *greater Whole*, or the *Manner of Expression* of St. Peter, and the rest of the Sacred Writers. And that Mr. Cook's Sense may not be injur'd by the external Influence of the common receiv'd Distinctions of Verses, and Stops; I have given it you, my Lord, in the Manner he himself chuses it should, without any, Οὐ γὰρ σκοπισμένοις μύθοις ἐξακολουθήσαντες ἠγνοήσαμεν ὑμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δύναμιν ἢ παρουσίαν, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πάλαι γενηθέντες τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλειότητος

βωτ ἡδ' παρὰ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς τιμὴν ἢ δόξαν φαίνῃ
 ἐνεχθεῖσιν αὐτῷ τοιαῦτα ὑπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς
 δόξης οὐτέστι ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός ἐν ἐγῶ
 αἰδοῦμαι καὶ ταύτην τὴν φωνὴν ἡμεῖς ἀκούσαμεν
 ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἐνεχθεῖσαν σὺν αὐτῷ ὅτις ἐν τῷ ὄρει
 τῷ ἁγίῳ καὶ ἔχομεν βεβαιώτερον τὸν προφη-
 τικὸν λόγον ᾧ καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες ἀκούον-
 τες φαίνοσθε ἐν αὐχμηρῷ τόπῳ ὅτι οὐ ἡμέραι δια-
 γασθῇ ἡ φωσφόρος ἀναείλη ἐν ταύτῃ καρδίᾳ ὑ-
 μῶν ταῦτα πρῶτον γινώσκοντες ὅτι πᾶσα προ-
 φητεία γραφῆς ἰδίᾳς ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεσθαι οὐ
 ἡ διδασκαλίᾳ ἀνθρώπου ὑπέχθη κατὰ προφητείας
 ἀλλ' ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν
 οἱ ἅγιοι Θεοῦ ἀνθρώποι.

As the Apostle's Design, in this Passage, may receive Light from the whole Epistle; and the Second Epistle may have a Relation to the First; it may not be improper to *take the whole into View*. This general View may have its Use, in order to ascertain what is the Sense of this Passage, as it has had in shewing what is *not*.

That there is *one common Design* to both Epistles, and *what* that Design is, St. Peter himself, in his Second Epistle*, very plainly informs us. "This Second Epistle, Be-

* iii. 1.

" loved,

"loved, I now write unto you (*ταύτην ἡδὲ*
δευτέραν ἐπιστολήν), in both which (*ἐν αἷς*)"
 he does not *instruct* the Jewish Converts of
 the Dispersion he writes to in what they *did*
not know before, but "*stirs up* their pure
 "Minds, by way of Remembrance," to what
 they *did*. Remembrance of what? * 'That
 'ye may be mindful of the Words (*ῥήματα*)
 'which were spoken before by the holy Pro-
 'phets, and of the Commandment (*ἐντολή*) of
 'us the Apostles of the Lord and Saviour.'
 You see, Sir, *what the Motives* are, which the
 Apostle uses in both Epistles: Now these
 Motives may, and, in Fact, we shall find,
 are, applied to *different Purposes* in different
 Places of the Epistles, tho' the Motives
 throughout be the same. Whatever, in par-
 ticular, may be intended by these *ῥήματα* of
 the Prophets, and *ἐντολή* of the Apostles;
 'tis plain they are those of the *First* Epistle,
 as well as the *Second*; and, probably, are
 more fully and explicitly mention'd in the
 former, than the latter; there being no more
 Occasion, when they are once stated, but to
 refer to them afterwards, as the Apostle, by
 these very Terms themselves, evidently does
 to something preceding.

Now if we look into the First Epistle, we shall find St. *Peter*, under different Expressions, setting to View *one and the same Thing*; that, indeed, which is the great and actuating Motive of the Christian, on the Side of private Good; “* their being begotten again to an Inheritance incorruptible and *undefiled*, and that *fadeth not away*; “reserved in Heaven for them—a Salvation † ready to be revealed in the last Time—“Praise, ‖ and Honour, and Glory, at the “Appearance (*ἐν ἀποκαλύψει*) of *Jesus Christ*—even ‡ the Salvation of their Souls.” The three next Verses, as becomes the Apostle of the Circumcision, to the Converts of the Circumcision, are employ’d to shew, that this Salvation of their Souls was the Salvation which the Prophets, by the Spirit of *Christ*, which was in them, testifying before-hand his Sufferings, and *the Glory which should follow*, had spoke of; and was now reported to them by them that had, by the Holy Ghost, preach’d the Gospel unto them. Let this suffice here, for the *summary Sense* of these three Verses; we shall have Occasion for the more critical Dis-

* Chap. i. Ver. 3.

† Ver. 5.

‖ Ver. 7.

‡ Ver. 9.

cussion of them hereafter. The Apostle has no sooner set to View the Great Object of Christian Desire, but he immediately begins his Exhortations. The first is to that Hope, but given in such a Manner as puts them in mind, likewise, of the only allow'd Condition of the Hope, as well as the Hope itself—their being *Children * of Obedience*, not *fashioned according to their former Lusts in their Ignorance*, but as he who had called them is holy, being holy in all manner of *Conversation †*: Putting them in mind of God †, without respect of Persons, judging according to every Man's Work, and of the Value infinitely superior to all worldly Things, of what it had cost to redeem them from that vain || *Conversation which they had delivered down to them from their Fathers*. After which he proceeds, on this Foundation, to exhort to all the Variety of moral Duties of a Christian, as well as to fortify the Mind against that suffering Scene, which every Christian, if he had not experienced, had Reason, however, to expect.

The same Motive, the living Hope ‡ to

* Chap. i. Ver. 14, 15.

† Ver. 17.

|| Ver. 18.

‡ 1-3.

which

which they were begotten by the Resurrection of *Christ*, placed to View in the Beginning of the Epistle, and in the Course of it said to be that which the Prophets had foretold, and the Evangelists declar'd, is occasionally recurr'd to: The Joy at the Revelation * of the Glory of *Christ* is brought in Support of the Christian Constancy under Persecution; and the Apostle, in order to animate the Presbyters to a due Discharge of their Office, puts them in mind of the Glory † that shall be revealed, and the Crown of Glory ‖ that fadeth not away, which they should receive when the chief Shepherd should appear, and takes his Leave of them all at the Close of the Epistle; with reminding them of the eternal ‡ Glory of God in *Christ Jesus*. These are all the Places, I think, in the Remainder of the Epistle, wherein the same animating Object is brought to View; nor is there, through the Whole, any Command of the Apostle's, but the Exhortations which he himself gives; nor any Word of any Prophet, tho' St. Peter, in a particular Manner, abounds in scriptural Expressions and Quotations from the Old

* iv. 1, 3.

† v. 1.

‖ Ver. 4.

‡ Ver. 10.

Testament, interwoven with his Discourse, urg'd to the same Effect, but those in the three Verses of his first Chapter of this Epistle. The same Thing is, indeed, in a Place or two more, brought as an Object of Terror, as in others of Hope, *the giving an Account to him that is ready to judge the Quick and the Dead*; which, compar'd with the *Salvation ready to be revealed in the last Time*†, and the Promises made at the *Appearance or Revelation* (ἐν ἀποκαλύψει) of Christ, leaves no Room for doubting what is every-where meant by this Revelation. But here, too, there is no more Reference to particular Prophecies, or Prophecy in general, than before.

The Second Epistle, just as the First, begins with putting those, to whom he wrote, in mind of the same Object of their Hope; but this, in such a Manner, as to suppose them acquainted with the First Epistle, and with a more repeated and pressing Remembrance of that great Doctrine of Christianity, the inseparable Connexion between Enjoying the Rewards, and Doing the Duties of it. St. Peter, therefore, immediately, in the Ad-

• Chap. iv. 5.

† Chap. i.

dress itself, joining together, as Things
 not to be separated from one another,
*Life and Godliness**, proceeds to remind
 them of "the exceeding great and pre-
 cious † Promises, by which, having es-
 caped the Corruption that is in the World
 through Lust, they might be Partakers of
 the Divine Nature, and then presses them
 to the Accumulation of the Christian Graces
 there mention'd ||, the adding to Faith, Vir-
 tue, &c. "For if these Things be in you,
 and abound, they make you that you shall
 neither be barren ‡ nor unfruitful in the
 Knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ.
 "But he that lacketh these Things is blind,
 and cannot see far off, and hath forgotten
 that he was purged from his old Sins."
 He then repeats his Exhortation, and re-
 impresses the doing these Things as the in-
 dispensable Condition of obtaining the Pro-
 mises, which he does under the Phrase of
making their Calling and Election sure.
 "Wherefore the rather **, Brethren, give
 Diligence to make your Calling and Ele-
 ction sure; for if ye do these Things, ye

* Chap. i. Ver. 3. † Ver. 4. ‡ Ver. 5, 6, 7.
 § Ver. 8, 9. ** Ver. 10, 11.

" shall never fall; for *so* an Entrance shall
 " be ministred abundantly into the everlast-
 " ing Kingdom of our Lord and Saviour
 " Jesus Christ." The Reason of the Apo-
 stle's putting them in Remembrance of these
 Things was not Ignorance, or any present
 Corruption they were fallen into; for they
 " knew them *," and were established in the
 " present Truth;" but the Fear of some-
 thing future of those insidious Doctrines,
 indulging Men in a Dissolution of Manners,
 and evading Persecution, by denying the
 Lord that bought † them, which some He-
 resarchs to be mentioned presently were
 about to bring in, and whose seditious
 Ways many would, to the Scandal of the
 Cause of Truth, follow; who, among their
 other Corruptions of the Truth, would
 turn into Ridicule the " Promise † of the
 " Coming of Christ." And to guard his
 Christians against the Danger they would
 be in from these Men after his Death,
 which was now approaching, he writes
 this second Epistle, that he might thereby
 not only stir them up, by putting them in

* Chap. i. Ver. 12.

† Chap. ii. 1.

‡ Chap. iii. 4.

Remembrance while he was *alive*, but that they might too, after his Decease, have these Things always in Remembrance. " I think it meet, as long as I am in this Tabernacle, *to stir you up* *, *by putting you in Remembrance*, † knowing that I must shortly put off this my Tabernacle. — Moreover, I will endeavour, that you may be able, after my Decease, to have these Things always in Remembrance." And therefore, " this Second Epistle, Beloved †, I now write unto you; in both which I stir up your sincere Minds, *ἐκκαυχώμενοι* *ἐν τῇ ἀπομνηστει*, by way of Remembrance, that ye may be mindful of the Words which were spoken before by the holy Prophets, and of the Commandment of us the Apostles of the Lord and Saviour, knowing this first" (as the especial Object of this Second Epistle), " That there shall come in the last Days Scoffers, walking after their own Lusts, and saying, Where is the Promise of his Coming?" The rest of the Epistle is an Antidote to this Poison; with an Exhortation in the Close to that

* Chap. i. 13.

† Chap. i. 14, 15.

‡ Chap. iii. 1. &c.

exemplary Purity of Manners he had in the Beginning been urging, and to Stedfastness in the Faith.

And how does this, my Lord, now follow? Is there any Chasm in the Sense? Any thing wanting to make the Connexion full and complete? But you know, the Connexion, as it here stands, is between the Verses immediately preceding the polemic Passage under Consideration, and the Beginning of the 3d Chap. and consequently, all between is but one *great Parenthesis*, into which the Apostle is carried occasionally from the mention of his Solicitude for them. The *and therefore*, which I have supplied, or something like it, would have been necessary, had the Words immediately followed one another; but there is no room for any such Particles of Connexion after a long Parenthesis, and there is evidently no Break in the Sense.

All this, the Six Verses of the Passage, and the succeeding Chapter to which it is connected, being therefore plainly *parenthetic* to the Course of the Epistle, its very Nature, as a Parenthesis, will furnish us with no inconsiderable Clue to the *precise and determinate*

determinate Intention of it. In a Period, the parenthetic Part contains something plainly *different* from the principal, but *relative* to it; and though not necessarily, yet generally relative to the preceding Part; and this more especially in a Parenthesis of a *Subject*, as is this before us.

Now this Passage plainly rises out of a Place where the Apostle is speaking of Himself, Himself only, which led him to put them in mind of what he had taught them, and his great Concern for them — γὰρ — ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δύναμιν καὶ παρουσίαν. Where if we take the γὰρ as a Particle of Transition only, as it *sometimes* is, as well as the *nam* of the *Latins*; or for what it *more generally* is, a *Causal*, and with the *Translators* render it for, *as a Reason* for his Desire of leaving behind him something which might be a kind of testamentary Memorial of the Doctrine he had taught; in either Sense the Expression is such, “for we have made known unto you,” as to leave us in no doubt who the *you* or the *we* here is. The Reason however does not end here: He had not only taught them the Doctrine, but

knew it to be true, not *having* been imposed on, or *followed* the *cunningly* devised *Fables* of others, but having been an Eye-witness of his Majesty, *οὗτος ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ἀληθινός* *οὗτος ὁ ἀληθινός* *οὗτος ὁ ἀληθινός*, in that Scene of his Honour and Glory when he received the Testimony of his being the promised *Messiah*, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased;" and the Voice, which came from Heaven, *οὗτος ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ἀληθινός* *οὗτος ὁ ἀληθινός* *οὗτος ὁ ἀληθινός*. 'Tis as plain who the Ear-witness were in Fact, as who the Eye-witness. But though St. *James* and St. *John* were so, equally with St. *Peter*, yet there can be no doubt from what the Mention of the Fact rises out of, that 'tis *himself* he understands by *we* all along; and that the Christians to whom he wrote, are distinctly wrote to in the Second Person, *we* have made known unto *you*. Then follows, "We have also a more sure Word of Prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye attend." Now, whether we connect the *have also* with the whole preceding Period, as his Lordship, or with the *we heard* a Part of it, as Mr. *Cooke*, one would think there could be no more

more doubt who the *we* and the *you* are in this Sentence, than in the first, since 'tis out of doubt, that 'tis the same Person that still speaks, and that the Persons spoken to are the same Persons here as there. Can we suppose that the Apostle, how neglectful soever of grammatical Exactness, could speak of all Christians in common in the first Person, in which he had confessedly spoke of himself in *contradistinction* to them, and then in the very next Sentence change the Person again, and speak of them in the second? I cannot therefore but agree with Mr. Cooke, "That if it be not certain that St. Peter speaks here of himself, nothing can be certain in Language."

Hitherto then the Apostle speaks of *himself*; nor does he of Christians in common, till he comes to the Attention due to Prophecy, — "to which ye do well to attend, &c." What follows to the End of the Chapter, is confessedly spoken of *Prophecy*, either Jewish or Christian, or both. And from the inspired by the Holy Ghost, in the End of the first Chapter, the Transition is made in the first Verse of the second, to the false Teachers he has in view: "But

“ there were *false Prophets* among the People, even as there shall be *false Teachers* among you *.” The rest of the Chapter is all a glowing Invective against the worldly Motives, and wicked Practices, of those, whose Scoffs, with regard to the Coming of Christ, *the principal View of the Epistle*, he proceeds to obviate in the third Chapter.

Let us now take a View of the Order of the whole *parenthetic* Part of the Epistle, together with its *Connexion* with the preceding and subsequent *principal* Part. The Apostle, having begun with setting before his Christians of the Circumcision the great and precious Promises of their Faith, together with the indispensable Condition of them, an holy Life, proceeds (a Thought naturally rising out of the View of the great Importance of the Subject to their Welfare) to express his Solicitude about their continuing in the same Stedfastness they were then ; and more especially, as he was soon to die a Martyr of the Doctrine he had taught, his Desire, that, after his Departure, he might, in another Epistle, leave

* Chap. iii. 1.

them

them a standing Preservative, by calling back to their Remembrance the Truths he had taught them : And, in the Mention of this, assures them, that it was not only because he had taught them the Doctrine himself, but because he had the highest Assurance, and greatest Certainty, of the Truth of it, from what he had *himself* seen and heard, and from that *surer Word of Prophecy* he had ; and what Attention was due to this Word, as being not from the Man himself, but from the Inspiration of the Holy Ghost, he next proceeds to shew. 'Tis easy to conceive what an Effect such a Preparative as this, for what was to come after, must have on the Minds of his Christians. With respect to the Subject, the infinite Moment of the Doctrine ; with respect to the Teacher, his great Love and Concern for them ; his disinterested Zeal for the Doctrine, even to dying for it ; his Sincerity in teaching ; his Distinction among the Apostles themselves, having, with only two others, been admitted to the first Scene of Christ's Glory ; and his having still that surer Word of Prophecy for the Truth of what he had taught them, that Word of

Prophecy, which was not the Word of Man, but God; and all this coming to them, as the last Monition of a dying Apostle, and of their Apostle too; all this with united Force must strike the Minds of those to whom it was written, and prepare them for that Indignation he designs, in the rest of the Parenthesis, to inspire against those false Teachers, whose greatest Danger lay in their insidious Doctrines, so suited to a weak and corrupt Nature^o, flying Persecution, and [†] indulging Inclination under the specious Name of Liberty. How successfully, in order to that End, would the Motives of Men, who [†] made Merchandize of them, be opposed to the disinterested Love they saw in the Apostle? Their ^{||} denying the Lord that brought them, to his dying in his Cause; their Lasciviousness; ^{oo} their walking after the Flesh in the Lusts of Uncleanness; ^{††} their having Eyes full of Adultery; to that inseparable Connection between the Hopes and Duties of a Christian, which he had been pressing on

• Chap. ii. 1. † Ver. 18, 19. ‡ Ver. 3.
 ‡ Ver. 7. oo Ver. 10. †† Ver. 14.

them,

them, with a View to these Enemies of both?

As the former Part of the Parenthesis rises naturally out of the Mention of himself then making; so is the latter relative to the former, and the mention made before of the Promises and Conditions of Christianity: And both are preparatory to what comes after, to guard them against that particular Doctrine of these false Teachers, *that Christ would not come again in Glory*, as subversive of the *Hopes*, as their others of the *Durée* he had been calling into Remembrance.

This being the Order and Dependence of the whole Parenthesis, so naturally rising out of the preceding, and suited to the subsequent Part of the principal Subject of the Epistle, but different from both, we may, I think, fairly conclude, that the Design of the Passage immediately under Consideration is, to place the *Authority of the Apostle* in its true and just Light, as a Teacher of the Doctrine of Christ's future Power and Coming, against *that of the false Teachers* who should come after; and consequently, that we are not to look for, here, the *general Evidences* upon which this Doctrine is founded,

founded, the Place for which is in the 3d Chapter; but consider it as subservient to its proper *Design*, which is to *establish the Authority of the Apostle on the Minds of his Disciples*, that it might, together with the necessary Connexion between what a Christian, as such, is to do and hope, insisted on before, be a Balance to the inveigling Doctrines of Heresiarchs after his Death. And this is done with so much *Address*, and so much *Modesty*, as he is forced to speak of himself, that it really adds a Weight to his Authority; and we may easily trace the same Humility, which in his Exhortation to the Presbyters of the Church, in his First Epistle, makes him call himself * a *Fellow-Presbyter*, *συνπρεσβύτερος*, and introduce this with addressing himself † “to those who have obtained like precious Faith with us.”

’Tis for this Reason, as being inconsistent with what appears to me to be the Intention of this Passage, that I cannot admit of Mr. *Ashton’s* Solution, which supposes the Apostle to be urging here the *general Evidences* for the Coming of Christ,

* Chap. iv. 1. † Ver. i. 1.

and *the same* as in the next Chapter. He besides understands the *we*, in "we have" also a more sure Word of Prophecy," of *Christians in general*; a Sense, which seems as contrary to all *grammatical Construction*, as to the *Design* of the Passage; and applies the other *we's*, which he owns refer to the Apostle only, as an Evidence to Christians in common, in a Manner, which appears to me, to say the best, too laboured, and not a little *perplexed*. But to dismiss Mr. *Ashton's* Scheme with so general an Answer, you'll perhaps, my Lord, think unbecoming the Regard due to him. I will therefore enter more particularly into it; and because he has one *previous* Reason for his Sense being the true one, which is, that 'tis impossible any of those before him should, I will previously consider his Objections to that of my Lord of *London's*, that is, indeed, to my own Sense too. In doing this, you'll please to observe, my Lord, that whenever I make use of *Prophecy* or *Miracle*, I understand the Gift, or communicated Power, of prophesying, and the Power of working Miracles; of *Prophecies* and *Miracles*, the whole of Prophecies delivered, and Miracles wrought,

wrought, whether those Prophecies were delivered, and Miracles wrought, mediately by such a Power communicated to Man, or immediately by God himself, or some super-human Being, as in the Miracle of the Transfiguration; by a Miracle, or a Prophecy, I mean *any one* such Prophecy or Miracle; and by *the* Prophecy or Prophecies, *the* Miracle or Miracles, some one or more such in particular. Methinks I see your Lordship smiling at this Parade at setting out: The real Reason is, that Mr. *affection* seems to me to have suffered, what many an ingenious Man has before him, an Elegance of Expression, or Affinity of Terms, to impose on him; and I was desirous of avoiding the same Snare.

This Gentleman's Conclusion of his Reasoning against my Lord of London is in these Words: "St. Peter never did compare Prophecy to Miracles as a Proof which he preferred *." Now, suppose the Reasoning ever so just, against whom is the Conclusion? Not against his Lordship; for he does not say, that St. Peter compares Pro-

plecy with Miracles, but the Prophecies of the Old and New Testament, by which the Power and Coming of Christ are foretold, with the Miracles of the Mount; for we will, not to perplex the Argument, with Mr. *Astton*, suppose, that his Lordship, by Prophecy, does not mean the Gift of Prophecy, but what is delivered by that Gift; and that by we, not the Apostle himself, but Christians, to whom he wrote, as well as himself, are intended; and that these Prophecies the Bishop understands St. *Peter* to say, do more "assure us of the Certainty of this future Event," than does that Miracle.

But you'll say, that the Words above cited, are but an Inference from another Conclusion, the general Result of his Reasoning on this Head; that Prophecy, before it is accomplished, is not a better Evidence for any Truth than Miracles, nor can admit of any such Comparison†; and that by Prophecy and Miracles, the Author here means the same as I express by a Prophecy, a Miracle, is evident from the Page before §. "A

* Page 22d of Edit. 1749.
§ Page 102.

† Page 103.

" Pro-

" Prophecy not fulfilled, cannot be said to
 " be a better Argument than a Miracle for
 " any thing, because it is no Argument for
 " *any* thing without a Miracle." Now, if
 he has proved this in general of *any* Pro-
 phesy whatever, he has proved it of *these*
particular Prophecies, and *this particular*
 Miracle. I allow it. But let me ask your
 Lordship, what is here meant by a *Pro-*
phesy? A bare Prediction *unprov'd* to be the
 Word of God? Or a Prediction *prov'd* to
 be his Word? There can be no doubt.
 Write, instead of *because* Prophecy, because
 a Prediction, *prov'd* to be the Word of
 God, is no Argument for any thing without
 a Miracle; and *because* a Prediction *un-*
prov'd to be the Word of God, &c. and
 from the Sense of one, and the Nonsense
 of the other, 'tis plain, that *Prophecy* there
 means *a Prediction unprov'd*. The same
 will appear in the intervening Paragraph
 between this and the Conclusion above,
 where the very same Reasoning is applied
 to the more sure Word of Prophecy in
 particular. * " 'Tis true, the changing the

" Point to be proved, from the Mission of
 " *Jesus* to his speedy Coming again in
 " Power, does vary the Case in this one
 " respect, but in this only, that it makes
 " Prophecy entirely necessary to the Proof
 " of it, because an Event that is yet to come,
 " can admit of no Proof without a Pro-
 " phesy; but it gives no Ground for com-
 " paring and preferring that Proof to Mi-
 " racles; because it is confessed, that *that*
 " very Prophecy can be no Proof, as in the
 " Instance of *Gideon*, of *Moses*, or in *any*
 " other, till it becomes so by the Addition,
 " and upon the *bare Strength* of a Miracle. *

It is very plain, that Prophecy *here* means
 a *Prediction not proved* to be the Word of
 God; and as the Course of this Gentleman's
 Reason requires this Sense, it must be this
 Sense of Prophecy which I imagine is
 made use of in the Conclusion immedi-
 ately following, unless he uses one Sense
 in the *Premises* of his Proof, and another
 in the *Conclusion*. But is it, my Lord, *un-*
prov'd Prediction that his Lordship thinks
 the Apostle intends, when he mentions *the*
more sure Word of Prophecy? Whether it

be or not, let his own Words, in his Exposition of the Expression, testify: * *We have a more sure Word of Prophecy*; i. e. we have the very Word of God (speaking by his Prophets), to whom all *Futurity* is known. Suppose †, with the Gentlemen of *Eton*, the Prophecies of the *Old Testament* only here to be meant, did the convert *Jews*, to whom St. Paul writes, look upon them as *unprov'd Predictions* only? Or, did not *they* believe them, and *be* urge them, as *the Word of God*? And indeed they were not only *believed*, but *proved* to be his Word, by the Credentials of his Mission which each Prophet bore: And the Christian Prophecies (if they are to be taken into the more sure Word of Prophecy) relating to the same Event, had their full Vouchers from the Miracles on which their Authentickness, as the Word of God, stands. The *Conclusion* therefore, let the *Reasoning* be ever so just, is nothing to his Lordship; and 'tis possible, notwithstanding all that the ingenious Mr. A. has said, that the Bishop of London's Sense of the Words may be the true Sense.

* Disc. i. p. 11.

† Page 34.

There is no reasoning from Prophecy, taken as an *unprov'd Prediction*, to Prophecy meant of *Prediction prov'd, and acknowledg'd to be the Word of God*.

But very possibly your Lordship will be led to think, from Mr. A.'s known Ingenuity, and the utter Impropriety of his Reasoning in the Sense of Prophecy for bare Prediction, to prove his Point in View, that by Prophecy he must mean Prophecy in the same Sense that St. Peter and my Lord of London meant it; but to this I must oppose an Authority, which is of great Weight with your Lordship as well as myself, Mr. Ashton's own: For thus he himself describes Prophecy, "Prophecy is nothing else but the Relation or *History* of "a future Act *"; and if, thro' the Whole of his Argument against his Lordship, you put, when he speaks himself, *Prediction* as one Word for *History of a future Fact*, instead of Prophecy, you will, I believe, scarce find one Place, in which that will not effectually speak his Sense of Prophecy. In † the Paragraph indeed just now quoted, where it is said, that Prophecy is intirely

* Page 94.

† Page 36. 33.

necessary to the Proof of Christ's coming again in Power, because an Event that is yet to come, can admit of no Proof without a Prophecy ; one would be apt to imagine, that as bare Prediction is no Proof at all of an Event that is to come, it must be Prophecy, *proved to be the Word of God*, that must there be meant : But as the Author there speaks but of something *in the Proof* necessary, as Prediction certainly is, what follows, " that very Prophecy can be no Proof " till it become so from the Addition and *bare* " *Strength of a Miracle,*" shews, that *bare* Prediction is here too attended by Prophecy, unless you will suppose that he *there* uses Prophecy in a different Sense from what he does *before and after*, and that the Reason is quite inconsistent with the *Assertion*. The Sum of his Reasoning is, that Prediction is necessary, and a Miracle to prove the Prediction to be the Word of God ; and as *both* are *equally necessary*, one cannot be *preferred* to the other.

It is acknowledged therefore, by Mr. *Ashton* himself, that tho' *one necessary Part* cannot be *preferr'd* to the other as an Evidence, yet *both together* complete the Evidence,

dence, and afford a better Proof than one only. Indeed, neither one nor the other, separately, are any Assurance at all; and, as he justly says, they make together but one Proof. If so, and St. Peter did intend by Prophecy, not Prediction only, but Prediction by the Word of God, the Evidence arising from such Prophecy, is *more sure* than that of Miracle alone, and *one* may, with as much Propriety, be compared to the other, as the *Whole* to a *Part*. Thus, my Lord, Mr. *Ashton's* Reasoning against what is not his Lordship's Meaning, is, or I am much mistaken, a distinct Proof, that what he *really means*, is, if not true, however possible to be true; which is quite contrary to what he intended to prove.

The Sense on which Mr. *Ashton* here reasons on Prophecy, as *bare Prediction*, tho' 'tis a vulgar Sense of it, is not only different from St. Peter's, but from the Scriptural Notion of it in general, which includes *Inspiration* in the Idea of it; nay, where προφητεία is used of Prediction not inspir'd, which I do not remember to be above once, Prediction pretended to be inspir'd, tho' it was not really so, is meant thereby: And,

what is still worse, this Ambiguity of the Term has not only confounded Mr. *Astley* himself, but very possibly may the *Subject* too, which being thus *envelop'd*, it may be of some Use to endeavour to *develop* it.

Miracle of itself proves nothing but the more than human Power of the Worker; and, as the *Miracle* may be circumstanced, of his Benevolence too, which we do not here take into Consideration. But when a *Miracle* is wrought, and the Intention of the *Miracle* expressly declared to be to prove any particular Doctrine, still the *Miracle* proves only the above Power of the Worker, and the *Evidence of the Doctrine* rests only upon this, that *such Declaration is the Word of God*; and should not the *Miracle* be thus explicitly *connected* with the Doctrine, the *Miracle* can do no more but contribute the Evidence it has to prove the *general Mission* of the Worker. But still all *Doctrines* taught under that general Mission, derive their *Authority* from their being the *Word of God*, and that they are taught under the *Inspiration of the Holy Spirit*; for whatever is delivered by such a one, not under such Inspiration, is still the *Word of Man*,

Man, and not of God. Now the delivering of any thing under such Inspiration, be the Thing deliver'd either a *Doctrine*, in the proper Sense of the Word, or a *Command*, or a *Hymn*, or a *Thing not known by human Means*, is, as well as a *future Event*, in the *scriptural* Sense προφητεία, or *Prophecy*, which denotes sometimes the *Act*, sometimes the *Gift*, or *communicated Power*, sometimes the *Thing so deliver'd*; and sometimes a *Collection of such Things*. Thus all these Communications from the Deity to Mankind, even where a Miracle is wrought, and a Declaration made, that the immediate Intention of it is to assure them of one particular Point, are by *Prophecy*; and *Miracle* has no more to do but to *authenticate* the Prophecy, and prove that the Communication is *from God*: And, indeed, 'tis only Miracle, and accomplish'd Prophecy, that can prove this to Mankind.

But tho' no *Miracle* alone can prove any Doctrine expressly *but by Prophecy*, yet some Miracles may be *so circumstanced*, that some *Doctrines* may appear *probable* from them. Thus, tho' it must be a very fertile Imagination, indeed, that could find out any Con-

nexion between our Lord's restoring blind *Bartimæus* to Sight, and his *future Coming and Power*; yet the Miracle of the *Glorification* affords *some Hopes* of it, that of his *Resurrection* much *greater*: But 'tis from the *express Prophecies* relating thereto, that we are *sure* of it. And can it be denied, that the Assurance a Christian has of this, is much greater from these, than from the *Transactions of the Mount*? If it can, let me ask, supposing there were *no Prophecies*, no Declaration, in the sacred Books, relating to this; Would that Miracle afford him as strong, and as rational Hopes of it, as he *now has*? If not, then his Hopes are founded *more* on the one than the other, and the Evidence from the *Prophecies* is greater than from the *Miracle*; and surely a *greater* will admit of a Comparison with a *less*. This, my Lord, is a *summary State* of the Case; the *fuller Consideration* will follow, in its proper Place.

© I hope now, my Lord, you will allow me, if it be only for your own Ease, to conclude, that 'tis *not impossible* but his Lordship's Explication of this Passage may be true; and that *St. Peter might compare* the

the Word of Prophecy with the Miracles of the Transfiguration and the Divine Voice, and consider it as preferable, in point of Proof of the Doctrine of *the Power and Coming of Jesus Christ* *; nay, to conclude, that the Interpretation of Dr. *Sherlock*, the present Bishop of London, in the first of his *much-admir'd* Discourses †, stands upon the same Foot of Credibility, it did before the Attack made on it by Mr. *Ashton*, present Fellow of Eton, in his *much-admir'd* Dissertation.

But 'tis possible, that Mr. *Ashton's* Solution may have less Difficulties than his Lordship's: If it has, *in the Name of Truth*, let it be preferr'd. Let us then proceed to the Examen; and sure Mr. *Ashton* cannot take it amiss, that I do that with *his*, which *he* has done with my *Lord of London's*: And I believe I may venture to assure you, that I shall not do it with less Decency. I here, once for all, would be understood to lay in my Claim to all that Excuse for the Freedom of Examination I take with these two Gentlemen, which Mr. *Ashton*, in the Advertisement to his Dissertation, with a Modesty and

* P. 12.

† P. 87.

Elegance which must charm every Reader of Taste, has done, for that he has taken with the *great Names* he found himself obliged to dissent from.

Mr. *Ashton's* Solution, then, as he has summ'd it up himself in a *Prosopopæia* of the Apostle, is this * : “ I confess your Affections are great; but are not your Expectations so too? You expect nothing less than a *glorious Kingdom*, which has been promis'd by *Christ* your Master; and you have convincing Arguments for your Hopes: For we heard God acknowledge him for His Son; we saw God, at the same Time, give him a Specimen of His *future Glory*.

“ And this Hope of Glory and a Kingdom corresponds entirely with what the Prophets have successively declar'd to you. They always gave you high Expectations of Glory and Power; they told you of an *everlasting Kingdom*; and the Holy Spirit, whose Influence they confessedly were under, does now assure you, that that very Kingdom is reserved for you in Heaven.

* P. 151, 152.

“ Your

“ Your Argument from Prophecy is, by
 “ this means, stronger than ever it was:
 “ Your Prophecies are now become a surer
 “ Guide to you, because you *understand*
 “ them better: You were liable to many
 “ Mistakes and Disappointments, when you
 “ were left to your own Conjectures, about
 “ the Intent of them: You can now be
 “ liable to none, since *God himself* has been
 “ pleas’d to explain to you their Intent.”

In the last of these Paragraphs is explain’d
 the *Connexion* between the *surer Word of*
Prophecy, and *no Prophecy of Scripture is of*
private Interpretation, which follows; and
 the Explanation is in so clear and apposite a
 Manner, that one is struck with it at the first
 Appearance, and sees, at once, that it bids
 fair to be true. But all before has some-
 thing which we can find no Footsteps of in
 the Apostle’s Words, and supposes him to
 be here urging the *general* Evidences for the
 Coming of *Christ*, *Miracle* and *Prophecy*,
 and resting the Christian’s Hopes, as to *Mi-*
racle, on that of the Mount; and with re-
 spect to *Prophecy*, on the Prophecies of the
Old Testament now explain’d by the Holy
 Spirit under the New; and that those Pro-
 phecies,

phacies, by these Explications, are *now* become surer: So that the Comparison is not of Prophecy, and the Miracles of the Mount; but of *Prophecy with itself*; of Prophecy *before* and *then*; which is one of the old Interpretations rejected by his Lordship for placing the Comparison where the Apostle had not placed it.

In the first Paragraph the whole controverted Passage is made to rise out of, and be intended as a Support against what there is not one Word of in the whole Epistle. The Apostle, in the Dissertation, begins with saying, *I confess your Afflictions are great*; but the Apostle, in the Epistle, has not a Syllable about Afflictions, from the Beginning to this Place. How, then, can the Passage *rise out of the Mention of it*, as it must do if it be *oppos'd* to it? Nor can it be said that the Apostle was led to set before them the Evidences of their Hopes, in order to fortify their Minds against the Prospect of Persecution, as this was the *End* of the Epistle; and he *might* have that End in View in this Place, tho' there is no express Mention of it. For tho' this is *Part of the End of the First Epistle*, and the supporting Prospect

Prospect is frequently therein held out to that Purpose; yet it does not appear that this was *at all the End of the Second*, as no Mention is made of it thro' the Whole. The Temptations in the *Lord knows how to deliver the Godly out of Temptations*, of the Second Chapter, being plainly those of *false Teachers*, and not of *Persecutors*. Nor, after having done what was the Design of the Epistle to do, to *defend the Doctrine of Christ's future Coming* against the false Teachers, does the Apostle apply the Doctrine to the Support under Persecution; but to the same Integrity of Life and Manners he had been reminding them of in the Beginning of the Epistle, as the covenanted indispensable Condition of obtaining their Hopes.

" * Wherefore, dearly Beloved, since you
 " expect these Things, take care that you
 " be found unto him without Spot, and
 " blameless." And, after the Mention of St. Paul, he concludes the Epistle with that which was the Design he had in View in the writing it. " † You, therefore, Brethren,
 " knowing these Things before-hand, take
 " care that ye be not carried away with

* Chap. iii. 14.

† Ver. 17, 18.

" the

“ the Error of ungodly Men, and fall from
 “ your own Stedfastness ; but increase in
 “ Grace, and the Knowledge of our Lord
 “ and Saviour Jesus Christ, to whom be
 “ Glory, &c.” Thus the *Propriety* of set-
 ting to View the Evidences of the Hopes of
 a Christian, in order to support him under
 the most trying Duty, which would lead us
 to admit that those Evidences were, *in fact*,
 here set to View, will be none, when it ap-
 pears that that Duty was not then in the
 Apostle's Thoughts.

But let us proceed to the *more sure Word*
of Prophecy itself. Mr. *Ashton's* Sense of it
 is, that the Prophecies of the Old Testa-
 ment are *now* become more sure than *before*;
 and the *Means* by which they become so are,
 that “ the Holy Spirit, under whose Influ-
 “ ence the old Prophets confessedly were,
 “ does now assure you, that that very King-
 “ dom they promis'd is reserv'd for you in
 “ Heaven. Your Argument from Prophecy
 “ is, by this means, *stronger* than ever it
 “ was; your Prophecies are now become a
 “ *surer* Guide to you, because you under-
 “ stand them better.” Now in the Apostle's
 Words there is not any thing either of *That*,
 in

in respect of which the Comparison is made, of the *Word of Prophecy* being *now* surer than *before*, or of the *Means* by which it becomes surer; which, had this been the Meaning of the Apostle, never, surely, could have been the Case. If the Comparison here be with something *said before*, as is his Lordship's Sense, there wants nothing but the *Comparative* fully to express the Meaning: But if the Comparison be made between two Things *not spoken of before*, between Now and Before; and the Preference be given upon a *Reason not mention'd before*; is it possible that there should not be one Word to *express either* of them? The former is an Observation of *Estius*; but with what different Eyes do Interpreters see Things! Mr. *Ashton* declares*, that "He does not see how the Apostle could have express'd that Meaning" (that we have *now* a surer Word of Prophecy than before) "in a clearer Manner than he has done here. *Καὶ ἔχομεν ΒΕΒΑΙΟΤΕΡΟΝ τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον ΤΟΤΤΟ ΠΡΩΤΟΝ ΓΙΝΩΣΚΟΝΤΕΣ.* That is, as plain as Words can make it, *If we take this first into*

* P. 149.

“ *Consideration, we have a stronger Argument from our Prophets.*” Now what is this that is to be taken *first* into Consideration? That no Prophecy of Scripture is of private Interpretation. But is there not still here a *Chasm* in the Sense? Are there not wanting to fill it up, and preserve Connection, these *two Things*; That the Power and Coming of the Lord *Jesus Christ*, which he had taught them, was the Kingdom of the Messiah foretold by their Prophets; and that he had taught them this by the same Spirit thro’ which the Prophets had foretold it? And does Mr. *Ashton* shew us any thing, before or after, in the whole Passage, that *expresses* this? So that something else is wanting to make this *as plain as Words can make it*. Besides, the *Plainness* of this depends upon the *Plainness* that the *προφητικαὶς* does refer to the *We*, in *We* have a more sure Word of Prophecy. Why may it not be referr’d to the last Pronoun *Ye*, “unto which Ye do well to attend, “knowing this before-hand;” and be Part of the relative Sentence? This I think is rather *more grammatical*; nor can it refer to the Pronoun farther back, unless the inter-

mediate Sentence be flung into a Parenthesis, as Mr. *Ashton* indeed has done in his Translation, but without the Authority of one Edition, that I know of, to countenance it. All this consider'd, do you not think, my Lord, that *ἡ ἰσχυροτέρα ἢ πρὶν, τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον*, We have the Word of Prophecy *now* more sure than *before*, would have been *plainer*; and that St. *Peter*, if he intended this, would have *express'd* this in those, or some such Words? Especially considering that he has express'd the *ἡδὴ* in a Place where it is much less *emphatical* than here. Ταύτην ἡδὴ δευτέραν ὑμῖν γράφω ἐπιστολήν. *This Second Epistle I now write unto you*.*

These, my Lord, are the Difficulties which lie in the Way of Mr. *Ashton's* Solution, consider'd by itself, independent of the Arguments he makes use of to establish it. 'Tis but fair, undoubtedly, to give these their Consideration. He begins to "propose his Construction of the Passage, "which is natural, easy, and obvious, consistent with the Argument of the Apostle, "with the Truth of Things, and with the

* iii. 1.

E

" whole

" whole Tenor of the Gospel," p. 111. What follows from this to p. 131. seems to be intended as *preparatory* to his Explication of the Passage, which he there begins to enter on: Now, whatever is, thro' this *preparatory Part*, urg'd concerning Support under Affliction being the End of this Second Epistle, is already, I think, obviated, by what is just said on that Subject; and this seems to be all, in this Part, which is necessary to Mr. Ashton's Solution, as it differs from what appears, to me, to be the true one; For as to the *Coming of Christ*, in our polemick Passage relating to his *coming to judge the Quick and the Dead*, I entirely agree with him; and, instead of objecting, thank him for what he has said against another more speedy Coming being intended there.

After the *preparatory Part*, he proceeds to the *immediate Explication* of the Passage, thus*: "The Apostle suggests, to their Recollection, two Considerations: One from the Attestation of God to the Truth of *Christ's Mission*, at his Transfiguration, the other from Prophecy, as rela-

* P. 131.

“rive directly to the Question, and tending
 “strongly to confirm the Point he had in
 “View.”—And then, after a Recital of
 the Words *, “As these are the great Ar-
 “guments by which he intends to establish
 “his Doctrine, so they seem to be the Pas-
 “sages referr’d to in the latter End of the
 “Epistle; where he tells them, that his
 “End in writing to them was, that they
 “might be mindful of *the Words spoken*
 “*before of the holy Prophets*; and he adds,
 “of *the Commandments of the Apostles*—
 “for ’tis evident, that one of these Argu-
 “ments is founded on the Credit of *the*
 “*Apostles*, and the other will appear to rest
 “upon the Authority of the *antient Pro-*
 “*phets*. After which, he proceeds to con-
 “sider † the *Fitness* of these Arguments to
 “establish the *Point* they are intended to
 “establish, the future Kingdom of *Christ*.”

Now the *Fitness* of these Arguments to
 prove, what he supposes the Apostle did in-
 tend to prove, if we admit his Argument
 from the *Fitness* in all its full Extent, will
 prove no more but this, that it *might* be
 the Apostle’s End in urging them; *might*,

* P. 132.

† P. 134.

as the Means would be suitable to that End: Yet, what has been already said, and I think prov'd, of the Apostle's *immediate Design* in this difficult Passage, of its being Part of a long *Parentesis*; and of whom the *We*, in the *We have a more sure Word of Prophecy*, is meant; is, as far as these several Points are there prov'd, a Proof that this *could not* be the Apostle's End. For if the Apostle's *Intention*, in them, was to establish *his own* Authority on the Minds of his Disciples, against that of the false Teachers, who immediately follow; he must, in Course, be led to something *peculiar to himself*, and not *common to all Christians*. And if this be a *Parentesis*, 'tis inconsistent with the Nature of it, that the *very same* Thing, and that the *principal* Thing, should be said in it, which is just afterward said in the *principal Part*, to which this is parenthetick. Besides, if the *We*, in "We have a more sure Word of Prophecy," cannot be understood of Christians, in common, without incurring all the Absurdities there mention'd; the Explication of the Words, built on such a Supposition, must incur the same Absurdity; which, indeed, is so great, as to bring a

Dis-

Disgrace on any Solution which depends thereon.

I urge not this, however, to evade entering into the Discussion of the Fitness of the Miracles of the Mount to the End assign'd by Mr. *Ashton* (for as to the Fitness of Prophecy, as here understood, there can be no doubt); so far from it, that I would readily rest the Whole of the Argument on it, that 'tis impossible *St. Peter* should, from the Unfitness of 'em, use 'em for the End assign'd by Mr. *Ashton*; and that none could be more fit for the Purpose, was the Design of the Passage what we have made it. Now tho' the Fitness of it, to establish his own Authority, will only shew, that this *might* be; yet the Unfitness of it, to found the Hopes of Christians, in common, upon, is sufficient to shew, that This *could not* be his End. For 'tis impossible that *St. Peter*, under Inspiration, could make use of Means insufficient to the End; an End of such Importance, and which he had so much at Heart; and pass by Means, he had before him, altogether sufficient to that End.

Mr. *Ashton*, in stating the End here in View, seems very clear; the Apostle's Intention,

tention, in this Passage, is, "to *establiſh* the " future Kingdom of *Chriſt* by thoſe two " Arguments," the two before-mention'd; the Atteſtation at the Transfiguration, and the Prophecies of the Old Teſtament. Accordingly, he conſiders the firſt from p. 134. to p. 140. where he enters on the ſecond.

Now the obvious Senſe of *establiſhing* any Doctrine by Arguments, is, I think, what he, in the next Page, expreſſes, by giving *as conclusive a Proof as can be given of it*. Let us ſee, now, how the Atteſtation of God is ſuch a conclusive Proof of the future Kingdom from the Side of Miracle. It may be proper, however, previouſly to obſerve, that as this Gentleman had here a very difficult Subject, ſo his Terms are not a little confuſed. The firſt of the two Arguments, to prove the Fitneſs, is, in the Place above cited from p. 131. call'd *the Atteſtation of God to the Truth of Chriſt's Miſſion*. Now, p. 135. *the divine Atteſtation to the Miſſion of Chriſt*, is plainly meant of only one of the Miracles of the Mount, the Atteſtation of the Voice, as diſtinct from the Glorification, which is conſider'd ſeparately, as making up, together with the Atteſtation, this conclusive Proof.

In the former Place the same Form of Expression stands for the Attestation of the Voice and the Glorification together, for the *Whole of the Proof from Miracle*; in the latter, for the Attestation of the Voice only, a *Part of that Whole*. Again, as the Miracle of the Glorification, in the latter Place, stands for the *proper Glorification*; it seems, in the next Page, to stand for the *whole miraculous Transaction* of the Mount.

The Order of this *conclusive Proof*, as far as I can understand it, is, — from the *Nature* of the Attestation, and the Glorification, jointly † — that it was intended as a *Cordial*, against Desertion, to his Disciples || — that it having the Testimony of *three* credible Witnesses ‡, the utmost Evidence requir'd by the *Mosaic Law*, the *Jews*, to whom this Epistle was written, were oblig'd, upon the Principles of their Law, to receive it.

In the Part, from the *Nature* of the Miracles of the Mount, this ingenious Gentleman must have either forgotten himself, or I do not understand him. I will give you, my Lord, his own Words*.

† P. 134.

| P. 136.

‡ P. 139.

* P. 134.

“ First, then, the Voice of God gave,
 “ undoubtedly, a general Sanction to all
 “ the *Promises*” of *Christ*—“ and the Glory,
 “ with which God was pleas’d to invest him,
 “ was an indisputable *Earnest* of” what was
promised, “ the glorious Kingdom of *Christ*.”
 And then, † “ The Miracle of the Glorifi-

“ cation bears an evident Relation to the
 “ Event, of which it is produced as a Proof;
 “ and, when taken together with the divine
 “ Attestation to the Mission of *Christ*, is as
 “ *conclusive a Proof, as can be given*, of his
 “ coming again in Glory, if he has *pro-*
 “ *mised* that he will come again in Glory.

“ If any Man will dispute this, let him
 “ consider how the Proof of the general
 “ Resurrection differs from this. The Proof
 “ would be a good one, if the Miracle [of
 “ the Resurrection] had no Reference to
 “ the Thing it was intended to prove: As,
 “ in both these Cases, it has an unquestion-
 “ able one; it is, at the same time, a Proof,
 “ and a *Specimen*, of the Thing which is
 “ pretended to be prov’d by it.”

It is a Point agreed between us, and
 which Mr. *Ashton* has been very full in the

Proof of, that no Prediction can have any Authority, as the Word of God, unless it be previously *proved, by Miracle, to be the Word of God*; and as a *Promise* is but a *Prediction* of the *promisory* kind, this Prediction must be *authenticated into Prophecy*, or the Promise proved to be the Word of God by Miracle, that must first prove the Mission of the Promiser. Be the Promiser *Christ*, or an Apostle, 'tis the same Thing: When the Mission is proved, the Promise is proved to be the Word of God; as well, if made by an Apostle, as if made by *Christ*. Now, in Mr. *Ashton's* Scheme, the *verbal* Promise is supposed; besides this, one of these Miracles of the Mount, that of the *Glorification*, is *typical*, or a *Specimen*, as he expresses himself, of the second Coming again in Glory; and the other Miracle, the Voice of *Attestation*, proves the *Mission*: And, in both these Cases, the Proof of the *Mission* rests on a *single* Miracle. In the first, on the Attestation of the Voice; in the second, on the Resurrection of *Christ*; and the *Doctrine*, in both, on the evident *Relation* between the Miracle, and the Event of which it is produced as a Proof, together

together with the *Promise*. Let us first, if you please, consider the Proof of the Mission, and then, of the Doctrine; for both together make up *the Proof, as conclusive as can be given*.

Now is any *single* Miracle as conclusive a Proof of the Mission of the Gospel, as the Sum Total of *all* the Miracles wrought for the Proof of it? If so, to what End are all the rest? I always thought, that the Evidence of the Gospel-Mission, and of every Promise of that Mission, arises from the combin'd Evidence of *all the Miracles* wrought for the Attestation of it, and of *all the Prophecies* fulfill'd both of the Old and New Testament, and of *all the Types*, too, of the Old, whether *ritual* or *eventual*, which have plainly their Antitype under the Gospel-Dispensation: For *Rites and Events*, under a former Dispensation, may be *prophetick*, and design'd to be so, of Things under a latter, as well as *Words*; and one Miracle, Prophecy, or Type, may be clearer, and have more of the Proof, than another; but *the Gospel-Evidence is the joint Evidence of all*: Nay, Mr. *Ashton* himself has, in another Place*, observ'd, "Who

“ will contend with him that asserts only,
 “ that *two* Miracles are a *stronger* Proof
 “ than *one* ?”

For this very Reason, your Lordship's Candour, I know, will suggest, that Mr. *Ashton* must be *supposed* to mean, that it is as *conclusive* a Proof as can be given from any *single* Miracle, or Miracles, of a *single* Juncture. This, my Lord, will indeed save the *Contradiction*; but how will it then serve the *Argument*? The future Kingdom of *Christ* is an acknowledg'd Promise of the Gospel; and that this Promise is the Promise of God, depends on the very same Evidence that the Gospel itself does: And can it be supposed, my Lord, that St. *Peter*, had his Design here been to call up, in the Minds of his Christians, the Evidence on which their Hopes stood, as to Miracle, would have put them in mind only of *one* Miracle? But, even admitting this, neither is the Transaction of the Mount as *conclusive* an Argument, as can be given, of the Mission from *one* Miracle. That of the *Resurrection* is very aptly introduced, by the Author, to explain his Notion of the Proof, from Miracle, by Specimen; but, then, 'tis an Instance

stance directly everfive of the Position in the Paragraph before, that the Attestation of the Voice is *as conclusive* a Proof, *as can be given*, of the Mission of *Christ*; because the Resurrection is much fuller, and much *more conclusive* of it. *Resurrection* from the Dead is a Thing full as miraculous as the Voice; the Exhibition of one was but *once*, of the other *repeated*; in one to *one* of the Senses, and, if we take in the Glorification, to two only, the Seeing and the Hearing; the other to the Feeling, besides. One was attested by *three* Witnesses, the other by those *three*, and *all the Apostles*, and *Numbers of others beside*. The Resurrection is, indeed, a Summary of the whole Gospel-Evidence; the Thing itself is most apparently miraculous; it contains the Completion of *antient* Prophecies, and *Christian* Prophecy, with the *fulfilling* of it. St. *Peter's* first Sermon, under Inspiration, is a Proof of the *Completion* of antient Prophecies in it; and *Christ's* Prediction, to his Disciples, of the *Circumstances* of his suffering, and his *rising again, the third day*, from the Dead, of *Christian* Prophecy of it; and the Relation of the Resurrection, in all the

the Evangelists, of the fulfilling of the Prophecy; and this on frequent Proofs, and by Numbers of Witnesses, and who evinced the Truth of their Testimony, by Miracles wrought to support it. 'Tis on this Account, as being a *single* Fact, and not distracting the Attention, as a *Multiplicity* of Facts would do, and its being a *Summary* of the Gospel-Evidence, tho' not the *Whole* of it, that it is so frequently urg'd *singly* as a Proof of that Mission. So far does the Miracle, of the *Attestation* of the Divine Voice, fall short of being as *conclusive* a Proof of *Christ's* Mission as the *whole* Evidence of it, or as the Miracle of the *Resurrection* *singly*! How, then, could St. Peter rest the Proof of that Mission on it, when he had so much better at hand?

But let us proceed to that Part of the Miracle of the Mount, the *Glorification*, design'd to be the *Proof* of *Christ's* future Coming in Glory, as the *Testimony* of the Voice, was to be of his *Mission*. It was observ'd before, pag. that tho' no Miracle can prove any Doctrine expressly, but thro' Prophecy; yet some Miracles may be *so circumstanced*, that some Doctrines may appear

pear *probable* from them; and this *more or less* so, as the *Relation* between the Circumstances of the Miracle and the Doctrine are *more or less* obvious, and *striking*: But *no Evidence of this kind* can be *so great* as express clear Declaration; let that Declaration, as to its being the Word of God, rest on the *general Proof* of the Mission, or on any *particular Miracle* wrought on Purpose to prove that particular Declaration. The Evidence of Miracles of this Sort, *by Specimen*, is of the same kind as that of *Types*, which tho' in its *collective Force*, where the Types are numerous, and the Relation evident, is very striking; yet *no single Type* can have this Relation so obvious, as to make it, of itself, so strong a Proof, that such a particular Thing was intended to be prefigur'd thereby, as an *express Assurance* from God, that it was *so intended*.

A Man of Mr. *Astley's* Sagacity could not but see how much the Evidence of the future Coming of *Christ*, drawn from the *Glorification alone*, must be inferior to that of the *frequent express Assurances* of it under the Gospel; and, consequently, what was like to become of a Solution which
supposes

supposes St. Peter founding the Hopes of his Christians on so much weaker an Evidence, when he had, in his Hands, so much stronger: He, therefore, *supposes*, that St. Peter *supposes* these express Promises, in his Argument. On this Presumption, I imagine, that Christians might be *supposed* to know these Promises; and so they might *the Miracles*, on the Evidence of which they stood, as the Word of God, and the *Prophecies* of the Old and New Testament, relative to them. But the Apostle's Intention was, to *put them in Remembrance* of what they knew. And tho' these Promises they are *virtually* reminded of, in his saying, that he had made known unto them the *Power and Coming of their Lord*; yet would it not have heighten'd the Force of that *Memento*, was his Design here, to remind them of the *Evidences* of their Hopes, to have suggested to them, that it was the *general Doctrine* of *all* who had taught the Gospel, as well as *himself*. But as we would by no means stubbornly dispute every Inch of Ground, we are willing to *suppose*, what Mr. *Ashton* *supposes*: But, then, this Difficulty recurs upon us; What Occasion there was,

was, when he had no need to remind them of *express verbal Promises*, to put them in mind of a so much weaker *typical* Presumption.

But neither will the *Attestation* of the Divine Voice to the Mission of *Christ*, nor the *Glorification*, admitting it to bear that evident Relation to the Event of which it is produc'd as a Proof, which Mr. *Ashton* supposes; and taking in all the *express Promises* made by *Christ*, and, I will add, by all the Apostles too; neither will all these, together, *make as conclusive a Proof, as can be given*, of his coming again in Glory. For the *Sum Total* of the Evidences of his Mission, nay, those of the *Resurrection*, and *Ascension*, alone, if the Apostle had a Mind to establish their Hopes on single Miracles only, and not on the general Evidence, are, *together with those Promises, a more full and conclusive Proof* of it.

I have learnt, from Mr. *Ashton* himself, that the *Miracle* and the *Prophecy*, in this Case the *Promisory Prophecy*, make but *one* Proof. Let us apply this Principle to the Miracles of the Holy Mount, and to the whole Evidence of *Christ's* Mission. As to
the

the *Proof of the Mission, the Attestation of the Voice*, falls as much short of the *whole Evidence*, as that *Part* of it does of the *Whole*. As to the *Prophecy*, both Cases have all the *express Promises* alike : In the *Glorification* there is, besides, a *Typical Evidence* ; but the *Miracles of the Resurrection and Ascension*, which are both included in the *general Evidence*, have each of them, at least, as strong typical Evidence : The typical Evidence, therefore, of the *Glorification*, is *less* than such Evidence of the *Resurrection and Ascension* together. So that the typical Evidence of the *Glorification* is *somewhat less* than the typical Evidence in general, and the Evidence of the *Mission greatly less* ; consequently, the *Miracles of the Mount*, considered as one Proof, are *much less conclusive* than the *whole Evidence* considered as one Proof.

Let us compare them again with the *Resurrection singly* : The Evidence of them, as to the *Mission*, has been shewn to be greatly inferior to that Summary of the general Evidence ; and the typical Evidence is at most but equal : As much, therefore, as the At-

F testation

testation of the Voice falls short of the Resurrection, as to the Proof of the Mission, so much does the whole *Transaction* of the Mount, considered as one Proof, *fall short* of being *as conclusive of the coming of Christ, as the Resurrection alone*, considered as one Proof.

As to the *Ascension* singly considered, the Thing itself is full as miraculous in its Nature as the other, and has the *Attestation* of a *much greater Number*; its *typical Evidence* is as great; and it has, over and above, *an express Promise annexed to the Miracle*, that *Jesus should come again in like manner as they had seen him go into Heaven*; which can be understood of no other Coming than his Coming at the last Day to judge the World. Thus neither is the Attestation as *conclusive* a Proof of the Mission, nor the Glorification of the particular Doctrine of the *future Kingdom, as can be given*; since the whole of the Gospel Miracles are much *more conclusive* of the former, and include in them a *stronger typical Proof* of the latter; nay, the Miracles of the *Resurrection* and *Ascension* singly are *more so*, if one should indulgently understand those Words of *single Transactions* only. What

What Resource now has your Lordship's Good-nature but this, that Mr. *Ashton's* Expression, as *conclusive a Proof as can be given*, is not to be taken too rigidly, and that no more is to be understood thereby, than a *very good Proof*? But the Question, my Lord, is this, Whether the Scene of the Holy Mount be a very good Proof for St. *Peter* to make use of, supposing his Design here to be the reminding Christians of the Evidences of their Hopes, when he had so much better. Let us then consider *how good a Proof* it is of the Lord's Power and Coming.

Mr. *Ashton* is, I think, a little too sanguine, when in the Beginning of his arguing against my Lord of *London*, he lays it down as a *Postulatum* (for a Word of Proof is not there offered), and reasons from it as such, "That the Miracle of Christ's Glorification was wrought to ascertain the *Futurity of his Coming**", (I suppose *future Coming* is meant) and that "† it was wrought to support the Expectation of that Event." Now I am so far from admitting this as a *Postulatum*, that I must own I doubt much

* Page 92.

† *Ibid.*

whether it was *intended* as *any Proof* at all of it ; and, as evident soever as the Relation it has to that Event is said to be, whether it *has any Relation at all to it in particular*.

As to its being wrought to support the Expectation of such an Event, it is certain there is nothing in the Relation of any of the Evangelists to ascertain the Intention, that comes near “ In the like manner as “ you see him now in Glory, shall you see “ him come in Glory ;” nor indeed *a Word about the Intention* : And when the Author comes to prove afterwards, in Support of his own Solution, that it *was intended* for such a Proof, he expresses himself with more Circumspection *, “ It *seems* to have been “ considered so by Christ himself ;” and in the Conclusion of his Proof †, “ This Miracle *seems* therefore to have been design’d, “ in its original Working, to raise in the “ Disciples themselves a Hope which should “ be sufficient to counterbalance any De- “ jection, &c.” This is the second Head of Proof of the *Fitness* of it to *the End* he supposes. Now this Proof rises thus ‡ :

* Page 136.

† Page 137.

‡ Page 136.

“ Account

“ Account of this Miracle of the Glorifica-
 “ tion, in all the Relations of the Evange-
 “ lists, is a Discourse of Jesus to his Disci-
 “ ples concerning his Sufferings, &c. and
 “ the Miracle is wrought to support them
 “ under Dejection.” One would imagine, by
 the Author’s Manner of Expression, that
 the supporting Miracle was immediately
 wrought; but look into the Evangelists,
 and you will find it was six or eight Days
 after: So that this Discourse is no Circum-
 stance attending or belonging to the Miracle
 of the Glorification, but a Thing, which,
 being next in Order of Time before it, is
 related next before it. In this Discourse
 Jesus acknowledges himself to be the Mes-
 siah, but immediately apprises his Disciples
 of, what they little expected to hear, the
Suffering Scene that awaited him at *Jeru-
 salem*;—however, that he should *rise
 again the third Day*;—he tells them what
 they should suffer;—but * “ the Son of
 “ Man shall come in the Glory of his Fa-
 “ ther, with his Angels; and then he shall re-
 “ ward every Man according to his Works.”
 Nothing, I think, can be more explicit,

* *Matt. xvi. 27.*

than the Prophecy of this Coming of *Christ*, which is most obviously introduced on purpose to support them against the predicted Sufferings. And the Credit of that Promise with his Disciples stood upon all the Miracles wrought by *Christ*, and the Preachers of the Gospel, to that Time. What need, then, of One Miracle, to establish the Credit of what was establish'd on so many? Or could a *typical constructive* Evidence, that this Coming was foretold by this Miracle, equal the *express Promise* they had just receiv'd? But if this Miracle was wrought for the Benefit of the Disciples in *general*, why were not the Disciples in *general* present at it, and not a *distinguish'd Three*, only? And those Three * "charged, as they came down from the Mountain, to tell the Vision to no Man, until the Son of Man should be risen again from the Dead?" It requires, sure, no extraordinary Sagacity to discover why only *Peter*, *James*, and *John*, were admitted to the Honour: Rather I suppose the distinguish'd Place they held in their Master's Favour, than any peculiar Weakness of theirs, which wanted a peculiar Sup-

* Mat. xvii. 9.

port: Nor is it more extraordinary, that they should be favoured with a Vision, beforehand, of their Lord's future Glory; than that *St. Paul* should be able to boast of his Vision of Paradise, and hearing unspeakable Words, which it is not lawful to utter. What Reason, therefore, have we to think, that the Transactions of the Mount were intended as any Proof, *at all*, of *Christ's* coming to judge the World?

And tho' I doubt not but the Miracle of the Glorification is relative to *Christ's* State of Glory in some Part of it, or in the Whole; yet, I must own, I cannot see the *so evident Relation* it has to *that Part in particular*. For, of all the Circumstances describ'd as attending that great Crisis of Being, I see in the Glorification but one similar, which is, that of the Glory itself. The Ascension, to which the Promise of *Christ's* coming to judge the World was expressly annex'd, taken together with that Glory he ascended to, seems a *fitter* Antitype. His *going up* into the Mount where the Scene of Glory was to be exhibited, is, certainly, more analogous to the *going up* to Heaven, than to the *coming down* from it; and his Presence, with the

Glory recognizing him as his Son, with *Moses* and *Elias* attending on it, more *representative* of his Admission to the Right Hand of the Father, than of his coming with the Angels, to render to every Man according to his Works.

I should imagine, too, that the Words, "Here be some standing here which shall not taste of Death, till they see the Son of Man coming in his Kingdom," which Mr. *Ashton* supposes to be fulfill'd in the Transactions of the Mount, if they refer to the entering on his Kingdom, that Entrance should be dated from his *real* Entrance on his Glory; and not from a *Specimen* of it, in his State of Humiliation; and which was follow'd by the most afflicting Scene of all his Sufferings. Now I have learnt from *Christ* himself, that his *Resurrection* was his *Entrance into his Glory*, when, speaking of that and his Passion, he says *,—"Ought not *Christ* to have suffer'd these Things, and to enter into his Glory?" Judge, then, whether the Miracle of the Glorification, or the Ascension, ought rather to be deem'd the Epoch of the "*Investiture of Christ into*

* Luke xxvi. 26.

"*his Kingdom of Glory*†." This, probably, was the Reason, why the favour'd Three were not allow'd to declare the Miracle, till the Glory represented in it was just ready to open upon them; till his State of Exaltation, verifi'd in his Resurrection, made them ready to receive the News, and expect, with Impatience, the Completion of it.

I expect, my Lord, you will urge upon me, against this, St. *Peter's* own Authority, who, at least, *infers* the second Coming of *Christ* from the Miracles of the Mount: But, instead of what the Apostle there says making against this, I am going to produce it as an Evidence for it. He had not been impos'd on by the cunningly-devis'd Fables of others, in what he taught his Christians about the Power and Coming of *Christ*; but had himself been an Eye-witness of his Majesty (*τῆς ἰαείνου μεγαλειότητος*), of his present Majesty, the Majesty *he then had* when St. *Peter* writes, his Majesty at the Right Hand of God. 'Tis certain, that the Expression will bear this Sense, as well as the other; and the *for*, in *For he received Honour and Glory from God*, in the won-

derful Appearance then exhibited in the Mount, may, in as full grammatical Propriety, be referr'd to the *whole Sentence* preceding, as to the *latter Part* only, the Majesty; and then the Sense of it will be, for he *then* receiv'd Honour and Power, the Honour and Power belonging to the Majesty of the Son of God; or, which is a Term of the same Import, of the Messiah in his State of Glory which he *now* has at the Right Hand of God: Received *then*, when he recogniz'd him as his Son. 'Twas the Majesty which *Christ* enjoys with his Father; which he had the distinguish'd Honour of being admitted to be an Eye-witness of. All this follows grammatically and consistently, and therefore *may* be the Sense.

And we have these Reasons to think, that this is the Sense; for this is more suitable to the *Apostle's Design* in mentioning the Miracle, and to the *Manner* of his *Expression* here. His Design is, confessedly, to raise an *high Idea of the Dignity of the Miracle*; and, I add, in order to *establish his own Authority* in the Minds of Christians; and as much more, as his having been admitted to be an Eye-witness of the Glory which *Christ*

is now invested with, is more conducive to this, than his having seen him once in Circumstances of Glory; so much is this Sense preferable to the common Sense in which these Words are taken. His *Manner of Expression* is becoming his Design, *pompous, and full of Dignity*; μεγαλειότης, and μεγαλο-
 πρεπὲς δόξα, are the Terms he uses: And how much more emphatical and august is μεγαλειότης, understood of his Majesty in Heaven, than of the Glory in the Mount? Suitable to this is the Force of the Word ἐπὶ τῆς, which the Apostle makes use of here rather than αὐτῆς, a Word expressing the Idea of being himself an Eye-witness more strongly than the other. I inquire not here, whether the σοφισμένοι μῦθοι respect the τῶν σοφῶν, or σοφιστῶν μῦθοι, of the Greeks, or the Ἰουδαῖκοι μῦθοι of St. Paul, in the Epistle to Titus: 'Tis an Inquiry more of Curiosity than Use, and will afford little Light to the Explication of this so much controverted Passage. But 'tis certain, that * ἐπὶ τῆς was a *technical Term* in the *mystick Rites of Institution* among the

* Casaub. Exercit. in Baronii annales, Cent. I. p. 552.

Greeks; by which, he who was admitted to a View of the *most abstruse and conceal'd* Part of all their Mysteries, was distinguish'd from the *Initiated of the inferior Orders*. Now, supposing this Term to be borrow'd thence, and apply'd to that Majesty he had been honour'd with the Sight of; how much will it raise the Idea of the Honour he had been admitted to! And how much more suited to this, the Majesty which *Christ* enjoy'd in Heaven is, than the Glory of the Mount, singly consider'd, is easy to see.

But there is a still stronger Reason for the Majesty here signifying the *Majesty of the Kingdom he has with the Father*, which, when taken into Consideration, will shew these Words in their full Force. 'Twas this Majesty and Power, an elementary Doctrine of the Christian Faith in which all were instructed, and all believed, which was made the Foundation of the Christian's Hopes. The *Death of Christ* was consider'd as an *Offering made for Sin*; his *Resurrection* as a *Proof* that God had accepted *that Offering*; that our Sins were really forgiven by God, and we justified. This is the Meaning of *St. Paul*, in those Words of his,

his*, "He was delivered for our Sins, and
 "raised again for our Justification." God
 having raised him from the Dead, and given
 him the Glory consequent thereon; was the
 Assurance which he had given Christians of
 it, and of all that follow'd from it: So that
 their Faith and Hope, in this, was really
 Faith and Hope in God. Hence is that of
 St. Paul in another Place†: "And if *Christ*
 "be not risen, then is our Faith vain, and
 "we are yet in our Sins." And hither is
 to be referr'd that of St. Peter||; that "Bap-
 "tism saves us by the Resurrection of *Jesus*
 "*Christ*:" And, again‡, that it was "by
 "the Resurrection of *Jesus Christ* from the
 "Dead," that** "God has begotten us again
 "unto an Inheritance incorruptible and un-
 "defiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved
 "for us in the Heavens." And that their
 Faith and Hope, "who by *Christ* believed in
 "God, who had raised him from the Dead,
 "was Faith and Hope in God." It was to
 him, therefore, †† "who, being gone into
 "Heaven, is on the Right Hand of God; An-
 "gels, and Authorities, and Powers, being

* Rom. iv. 25.

† 1 Cor. xv.

|| 1 Ep. i. 21.

† 1 Ep. iii. 21.

** Ib. i. 4.

†† Ib. iii. 22.

"made

“made subject unto him.—* Under whose
 “Feet he had subjected all Things, and made
 “him Head over all Things to the Church,
 “which is his Body”—To the Majesty and
 Glory which their Lord had on the Right
 Hand of God, that Christians, as Members
 of that Body, were every-where directed to
 look up for an Assurance of what they were
 taught to expect.

This is what St. Peter undoubtedly had
 taught in Person to the Dispers'd of the Cir-
 cumcision, to whom he writes, if he had
 ever taught them in Person; but 'tis what
 he, most certainly, has done, in his First
 Epistle to them, in the Places before cited.
 'Tis with the *Resurrection*, as that which
 they were to rely on for it, that he *begins*
 their Hopes of that † *incorruptible Inherit-*
ance reserved for them in Heaven; that
Praise, and Honour, and Glory; that *Sal-*
vation of their Souls, which they were to
 receive at the Revelation of *Jesus Christ*;
 and 'tis with the same Resurrection he *ends*
 them||. And, notwithstanding what has been
 said of Prophecy, *between* these two Places,
 as the sole Foundation of those Hopes of

* Eph. i. 22, 23. † 1 Ep. i. 3. &c. || Ver. 21.

the Christian; it is introduced only as an Incident, to raise the *Dignity of the Object*, as being that which had been *foretold* by their *Old Prophets*, tho' not understood by them; and *declared* by the *New Ones* of the Gospel. The Force, therefore, of these Words, will be, "When I made known
 " unto you the Power and Coming of the
 " Lord *Jesus Christ*, I was not impos'd on
 " by cunningly-devis'd Fables, but was,
 " myself, an Eye-witness of that Majesty
 " of *his* with the Father, to which I have,
 " in my First Epistle, exhorted you to look
 " up, as what you may securely rely on, for
 " all that Honour and Glory which you
 " *yourselves* will receive at his Coming. I
 " was, besides, an Ear-witness to God the
 " Father's Attestation of his being his Son,
 " in the Character of which he enjoys all
 " that Majesty." As from the common
 Principle of all Religion, that God is a Re-
 warder of all those that diligently seek him;
 and from the Lord's being made Head over
 all Things to the Church, which is his
 Body; all, as Members of his Body, may
 be assur'd of his *Will*: "So, as he is now
 " invested with all Power, may you of his
 " Power,

“ *Power*, abundantly to reward your Obedience to his Commands, and your Sufferings for his Name.” The Connexion between *his Power* and *your Reward* is strong and convincing; but then it is still but Inference; and from his Power to reward you, there can be little or no Inference to *that particular Manner* in which I have assured you it shall be done; that it shall be by his coming at an appointed Time, to judge the World, and to render to every one according to his Works. The Inference can at most amount to no more, than that such a Coming is *consistent with the Power* he has, and therefore *may* be; but that this *will* be, “ I have a *more sure Word of Prophecy*, more *assuring* it than any such Inference, nay, than any Inference of your Reward which I can draw, even from what I both saw and heard of that Power;” an express Assurance of it, and of the Manner of it, by his coming in Person to judge the World, from the *Word of God himself*.

’Tis certain that the Apostle, in his First Epistle, did make known to his Dispersed, the *Power* of Christ in his State of Exaltation, as a Foundation for the Hope of the

incor-

incorruptible Inheritance, and the *Coming* of Christ, when and by which they were to receive it, as two distinct Things. 'Tis probable, therefore, that when he here speaks of having made known to them the Power and Coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, he means them as two distinct Things likewise: His Power, of his *present* Power; his Coming, of that *future* Coming. But let this Power and Coming be intended of two distinct Things, or together of the one Thing, called generally in his First Epistle, the *Revelation* (ἀποκάλυψις) of Jesus Christ; his Majesty, understood of his Majesty *as Christ at the Right Hand of God*, is much more strong and conclusive to every Point it can be applied to, than his Majesty understood only of the *Appearance at the Mount*. How much stronger is, “I have been an Eye-witness of that Glory he now has with the Father, which I have taught you,” than—“I was once an Eye-witness of a Scene of Glory he was honoured with before his Passion?” And as to *Inference*, no Inference at all can be made, either to the *Reward*, or to the *Time and Manner* of conferring the Reward, from

G

the

the Scene of the Mount *alone* : None without taking in the *State of Glory* Christ entered on at his Resurrection, a View of which *Peter* was honoured with beforehand. All that transient Glory would have been eclipsed, and all the Hopes to be drawn from it extinguished in the Passion. 'Twas a *first afflicted*, and *then glorified Messiah*, which the Prophets had foretold; Where then would have been the *Glory* after the *Suffering* ? Or what Hopes could a Christian have, when he would, according to *St. Paul*, had not Christ risen again, have been *yet in his Sins* ? How vainly would any Inference, drawn from the temporary Scene of the Mount, have been urged to support the Hopes of a Christian, when the Confession of Jesus himself, and the lost Situation he was left in, would have readily occurred to every one, to convince him, that he *in whom he had trusted*, was in Reality *forsaken of God*, and without all Power of helping him ?

Upon the Whole now, my Lord, of the *Fitness* of the Miracle of the Mount to the *End* supposed in alleging it, the reminding Christians of the Foundation of all their
 Hopes,

Hopes ; can St. *Peter* be thought to rest *all* on that *alone*, and overlook those of the *Ascension*, of the *Resurrection*, of *all the mighty Works* on which those Hopes did in Fact rest ? Could he here introduce a *new Foundation*, and neglect those much *more sure ones* he had mentioned before ? Could he urge that *as a Specimen*, of what it does not appear to be *any Specimen at all* ?

On the other hand, How comes this Miracle to be *mention'd at all* ? If this was *so circumstanced*, with regard to St. *Peter himself*, as *no other* Miracle whatever is, it is not unreasonable sure to conclude, that it's *being so circumstanced* was the *Reason* of it. And if no one Miracle can be produced, *so fit* to leave on their Minds, after he was gone, an Impression of his *Authority*, as an Apostle distinguish'd in the Favour of his Lord ; I may be allow'd to conclude, that this is a Confirmation, that the *Design* of the Apostle in this Passage is what I have before represented.

I have not enter'd into a Discussion of the Sense Mr. *Ashton* gives to the *Word of Prophecy*, as that is a Sense, which, however

they differ in other Things, is common both to Mr. *Ashton* and Mr. *Cook*. To ascertain the Notion of this, we must look a little more closely, than has been hitherto done, into the Terms made use of: A Work which we shall be the better qualified for, as the *general Design* of the Epistle, and the *peculiar* one of the whole controverted Passage, has, I think, been pretty exactly settled; for thus, if any Term has various Meanings, that may be made Choice of which is most *suitable* to the Design of the Passage and the Epistle.

In the Business of settling the Meaning of Words, the Rules of Criticism direct us, first to the *Author himself*; in the next Place, if the Subject relates to the Dogmata of any particular Discipline or Sect, to *other Writers of the same Sect*; then to *such Authors as the Writer himself imitates*, is most frequent in the Use of, or has a *View* to; and after all these, to the Use of the *Language in general*. In the present Case therefore, we are first to apply to St. *Peter in particular*; after him to the *Writers of the New Testament*; and in Notions common to both, or relative to the Old Testament, to *Writers*
of

of the Old ; and as St. Peter confessedly made use of the Greek Version, commonly called that of the *Septuagint*; quotes in their very Words, and is very frequent in his Quotations and Expressions taken from them, it is to the *Septuagint*, preferably to the original *Hebrew*, that we are in this Case to have Recourse ; and, lastly, to the *Greek in general*.

Mr. *Ashton* has entered into the Criticism of *αὐχμηρος* in this Passage, Mr. *Cooke* of *βλαβερός*; but both of them have overlooked that which is of principal Import in it, that indeed on which the whole Question turns, whether it is *at all* compared, or *with what*, ΤΟΝ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΙΚΟΝ ΛΟΓΟΝ, and considered it as an Expression of trite Signification, that needed no Inquiry ; tho' it occurs no-where else in all the Scripture, and the Terms of which it is made up, are, one of them, of *most various Signification*, and the other liable to be taken in a very *partial* Meaning. *Προφητεία*, my Lord, you see, has been taken for bare Prediction ; whereas even inspired Prediction makes but a Part of the Notion of it ; and *λογος*, besides its signifying, under the Notion of a Word, a

G 3
single

single Word, a Saying, a Report, a Discourse, a Treatise, Discourse or Conversation, Doctrine, a Law, a Command, Preaching, has, *out of that Notion*, those of Thing or Matter, Reason, Account or Reckoning, a Shew, and *εἰς λόγον with respect to*, and this only in the Books of the *New Testament*.

'Tis evident therefore, my Lord, from the Importance in the Passage of this Expression, and from the mistaken and very various Signification of the Words of which it is made up, that the *προφητικὸς λόγος* here deserves our Attention. And indeed had the Gentlemen happened to have directed theirs this Way, it would have saved them the Trouble of any particular Detail * to prove that the *Prophecies of the Old Testament*, relating to Christ's Kingdom, are here understood by the Word of Prophecy, since it would have appeared from the very Terms of the Expression, that neither *those* Prophecies of the Old Testament, nor *any other*, could be understood by them.

St. Peter's Manner of Expression, had he designed here the Prophecies of the Old

* Mr. Cooke's is from the 8th to the 18th Page.

Testament, would probably have been like what he uses in other Places, when he confessedly speaks of any Prophecies or Passages of the Old Testament. We might have expected,—*We have also* βεβαιώτερα * τὰ προειρημένα ῥήματα ὑπὸ τῶν προφητῶν—or † ἡ μαρτυρία ὅτι προεφήδευσαν οἱ προφῆται—or || ἡ γέγραπται, or περιέχει ὃν τοῖς προφήταις—or βεβαιώτερας τὰς προφητείας γραφῆς; but he no-where makes use of λόγῳ, when speaking of any Prophecies or Passages of Scripture. The very same Terms εἰρημμένα and ῥηθέντα, μαρτυρούμενα, γεγραμμένα, and γραφαί, γραφαὶ τῶν προφητῶν, γραφαὶ προφητείας, are the stated Terms of Expression throughout the *New Testament*, when the Prophecies of the *Old* are mention'd in it.

Indeed there are two Places in *St. Luke*, and one in *St. John* (tho' their general Manner of Expression is as above) where λόγῳ is applied to Prophecies of the *Old Testament*; as it is *written* § in the Book of the Words λόγων of *Isaias* the Prophet; and

* 2 Epist. iii. 2.

† 1 Epist. i. 10, 11.

|| *Ibid.* i. 26. ii. 6. 2 Epist. i. 20.

§ *Luke* iii. 14.

to this agree the Words λόγος of the Prophets, as it is *written* *, and St. *John* of Christ †, tho' he had done so many Miracles before them, yet they believed not on him, that the Saying λόγος of *Isaiah* the Prophet might be fulfilled which he *saith*,
 “ Lord, who hath believed our Report?
 “ And to whom hath the Arm of the Lord
 “ been revealed?” I might observe, that even here, when λόγος is used, it is not without one of the other stated Terms γέγραπται, εἶπκε, which the προφητικὸς λόγος, understood of the antient Prophecies, has no Pretensions to, no such Word being joined with it: But what is much more to my Purpose, is the Difference of *Number* in these Places. λόγος in the Singular is meant but of *one* Prophecy, or rather indeed of one Expression in that Prophecy; but when more than one Prophecy is spoke of, it is in the Plural; it is λόγοι, not λόγος. Carry this Inquiry, my Lord, into the Old Testament, where the Term, as applied to Prophecy, is much more abundantly used, and whence indeed it is borrowed, and you will not, unless a repeated Examination de-

* Acts xv. 15.

† *Ibid.* xii. 37, 38.

ceives me, once find λόγος in the Singular used for more than one Prediction; and whenever more than one Prophecy is mentioned, 'tis *always without Exception* in the Plural. One Prophecy is often spoke of in the Plural, but never once more than one in the Singular. It is observable, that when the *Hebrew* speaks of a Collection of Prophecies in the *Singular*, and, to vary the Expression, makes use of a Word which it seldom uses, the Translator employs the usual *Greek* Word λόγος, but in the *Plural* ὁ λόγος; are they not written in * the Prophecy of *Abijah* the *Schilonite*? And this tho' he had used it in the same Sense in the Words immediately preceding.

Is it now *one* Prophecy of the ancient Prophets, or *all*, that relate to the Kingdom of the Messiah, which these Gentlemen understand to be meant by the λόγος προφητικός? Or can it be supposed that it should *here* in the Singular be meant of Prophecies in the Plural, when there is not a single Place in the *New* or *Old* Testament, in which it is so used? I believe, my Lord, you will allow this to be a conclusive Argu-

* 2 Chron. ix. 29.

ment against the *Sense* which these Gentlemen have affixed to the Word of Prophecy, that is, indeed against the *Solution* of each. For the old Prophecies, relating to Christ's Kingdom, cannot be understood in this Place to be rendered more *sure* to St. Peter himself, by the Means of the Miracle, nor more sure to Christians in common *now* than *before*, if those Prophecies are not here meant by the Word of Prophecy. I may well, therefore, spare myself the Trouble of examining Mr. Cooke's Detail, to prove this *to be* the Meaning of the Word, if I have previously shewn that it *cannot* be the Meaning. However, the Substance of what is there said, will fall in with the Explanation of what *is* meant by the προφητικός λόγος in this Place.

That it is the same as ὁ λόγος τῶν προφητῶν, or ὁ λόγος τῆς προφητείας, is evident; but *what* is this Word of Prophecy which the Apostle *had*, and by which he was so fully assured of the future Coming of Christ? As the Term itself is borrowed from the *Septuagint*, 'tis there we must look for the Meaning of it. But as this λόγος plainly relates to Prophecy, and Prophecy itself is

a Term so liable to be misunderstood, even by the Learned, it may be proper to ascertain previously the Notion of *it*, before we proceed to that which *belongs to it*. In doing this, your Lordship will allow me, as 'tis ready at Hand, to extract a few Lines relating to *Prophecy*, from a manuscript Explanation of the several extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit, in the Apostolic Age, in a Comment on the 3 ch. which relate to them in *St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians*, wrote some Years ago, when the Methodistical Pretences to extraordinary Gifts from the Spirit naturally led to the Consideration of them.

" The general Notion affixed to Prophecy, is that of predicting or foretelling future Events, and the obvious Meaning of the original Word *προφητεία*, as compounded with *πρό*, *before*, leads to this Sense; but there is another * Etymology given of it by the Grammarians, as compounded with *πρό* in another of its Senses, *for*, or *instead of*, which shews the true Sense of it; that is, *one who speaks instead of a Divine Being, in his Name*,

* *Ham. on Luke i. 67.*

“ as one *inspir'd and commission'd by him*, as
 “ such, to make something known to Men.
 “ —In the first Dispensation of Religion,
 “ when there was *no written Revelation*,
 “ 'tis certain, however, that there were
 “ Communications from the Deity, not only
 “ by the Ministration of Angels, but by
 “ *Prophecy*. Thus *Abraham* was a Prophet,
 “ and so was *Balaam*. When there was
 “ a written Law, there were appointed
 “ *Interpreters* of that Law, the *Priests*,
 “ and a Method of inquiring concerning
 “ *future Events* by *their Ministry*, the *Urim*
 “ and *Thummim* ; but besides these, there
 “ were *Prophets*. The Business of these
 “ was not only *foretelling Things future*,
 “ but the *Regulation of Things present*.
 “ They declared what was *God's Will*, in
 “ *God's Name*, concerning such and such
 “ Things ; they *exhorted, deborted, pro-*
 “ *mis'd Blessings, denounc'd Judgments*, as
 “ from him, as well as *foretold future*
 “ *Events*. Besides this, when under *Inspi-*
 “ *ration*, they *rapturously uttered religious*
 “ *Songs and Hymns*.—There were dif-
 “ ferent *Degrees of Revelation*, as of Fa-
 “ vour from God, allowed in Consequence
 “ of

" of that different *Manners* of Revelation.
 " Of these there are three very distinguish-
 " able *ones* in the Old Testament, the
 " *Dream*, the *Vision*, and the *Word*. The
 " *Dream* was a *Representation of Objects in*
 " *real Sleep*. The *Vision*, in the proper
 " Sense of the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Terms,
 " and the *only one*, I think, in which we
 " use it in *English* on prophetic Subjects,
 " was the *Appearance of a Scene of sensible*
 " *Objects to the Senses*, and principally the
 " *Sight*, or such a *vivid Impression on the*
 " *Imagination* as if it was real *Vision*. The
 " *Word* was a *Revelation by the Ear only*, in
 " which it was *really affected* with such
 " *Undulations of the Air*, as it would have
 " been by Words really spoke, or the *Mind*
 " *had such Ideas excited in it*, as it would
 " have had by such real Speech. I do not
 " pretend here to the *Exactness of Defini-*
 " *tion*, but such a *Description*, as will give
 " such a *Notion of each*, as is sufficient to
 " make them clearly distinguishable from
 " one another. The *Dream*, and the *Vi-*
 " *son*, do in their Nature *require Interpre-*
 " *tation*; which is learnt either by *prophe-*
 " *tic Discipline or Institution*; such as may
 " be

“ be supposed to have been in the Schools
 “ of the Prophets, or *imparted* together
 “ with the Dream or Vision. The *Word*
 “ needed not this Interpretation, and was
 “ subject to no other Obscurity than that of
 “ the general Communication of Thoughts
 “ among Mankind, of Language itself.
 “ *Daniel* alone will afford Instances of the
 “ Dream and Vision, together with the In-
 “ terpretation of them given with them ;
 “ of the former, in the Dream of the four
 “ Beasts, and in the 7th Chapter ; of the
 “ latter, in the Visions at the River *Ulai*
 “ and *Hiddekel*, c. viii. x. &c. As to
 “ the *Word*, it is as evident as abundant
 “ Instances can make it, that under the Dis-
 “ pensation of *Moses*, and after his Time
 “ down to *Malachi*, there were afforded by
 “ God Revelations to the Prophets, which
 “ were not by Vision or Dream, in which
 “ God is said to *speak*, and the Prophet
 “ to *bear*, and which is expressly called Re-
 “ velation by the *Word of the Lord* ; * the
 “ Lord

* In this manner the Lord spake unto *Jehovah*, and from
 him to *Samuel*, Revelation by the *Word* of God seems
 to be rare indeed, there occurring but two Instances of
 it (*Judges* vi. 8. *Sam.* ii. 4) ; for the Appearance of an
 Angel

"Lord revealed himself to Samuel by the
 "Word of the Lord, at a Time when the
 "Word

Angel seems rather to belong to *Vision*; but thenceforward we have abundant. For thus the Lord *spoke* unto Samuel (1 Sam. c. iii. 8, 9, & *passim*); to Nathan (2 Sam. c. vii. 12.); to Gad (2 Sam. xxiv. 11, 12. 1 Chron. xxi. 9.); to David (2 Sam. xxiii. 2.), &c. After the Division of the Kingdom, to Shemaiah (2 Chron. xi. 2. xii. 5.); to Ahijah (1 Kings xiv. 5.); to the anonymous Prophet, who so long before prophesied of Josiah by Name, and his destroying the Altar at Bethel (1 Kings c. xiii.); to Jehu the Prophet (*ib.* xvi. 1.) to Elijah; to Elisha. Contemporaneous to these, we have three different Prophecies of the same Kind delivered to Ahab, in 1 Kings, c. xi. In the same manner came the Spirit of the Lord upon Jehaziel in the midst of the Congregation, and he foretold the Fate of the ensuing Day (2 Chron. xx. xiv. 8). In all these Cases the Prophecies are delivered in Words very apparent, and far removed from all dark Speeches; there appears to be no Traces of any Vision or Dream, and the manner of Expression is that which is always used in Revelations by the *Word of God*; such as the Lord *said*, or *spoke*, or the *Word of the Lord came to*, or he *came in the Word of the Lord*, or *thus saith the Lord*, or *hear the Word of the Lord*. If we proceed from these occasional Prophecies, to the Collections of them in the Books of the Prophets, we have the self-same manner of Expression for the Revelation; the Language of them is very various, more or less simple, or raised and figurative, according to the Occasion; but there are very few that are delivered in the way of Parable or *Ænigma*. There is but *one Vision* in all *Isaiah*, that of the Glory of the Lord, in one short Chapter (vi.), nor but *one* in *Jeremiah*, that of the Wine-cup, in Part of the xxvth Chapter, unless you suppose the seeing the Rod of the Almond-tree, and the Seerbing-pot, in the first Chapter, to be in Vision. The Visions in *Ezekiel* take up much more Room; but they are very few in Comparison to the Revelations by the *Word of God*. I do

not

" *Word of the Lord was precious, or rare,*
 " *and there was no open Vision, or Revela-*
 " *tion, as the original Word, of which*
 " *more hereafter, often signifies*.*

" In this Manner, and this Degree of
 " Prophecy, as distinct from the *Vision* and
 " the *Dream*, the lower Degrees, the Lord
 " spake unto *Moses*, to *Joshua*, to *Samuel*,
 " *Elijah*, *Elisha*, &c. and thus the *Word*
 " of the Lord came to *Isaiab*, *Jeremiah*,
 " *Ezekiel*, and the rest of the Prophets,
 " whose Prophecies, or the Words spake
 " by them, while under Inspiration, are

not recollect any in all the twelve lesser Prophets, except
 in *Zechariah*; but *Daniel* is all *Dream* or *Vision*. In
 all these Cases of *Vision* the *Word* of the Lord is never
 made use of, but when there is also, during the *Vision*,
 a Revelation by the *Word* to the Prophet, which is not
 in above two or three Places in the Whole. This, I pre-
 sume, will be sufficient to evince, that under the *Mosaic*
 Dispensation, and during the Age of Prophecy, there was
 a Species of it, of a higher Degree than *Vision* or
Dream, with which some were honoured; tho' I doubt
 not but these lower ones were much more common. I
 must add, that it does not appear, that this higher Revela-
 tion was attended with that Disorder of Mind, and Per-
 turbation of the Spirits, with which the Ecstasy of the
Vision and *Dream* was: We see but little of this in
Isaiab's Vision; but *Ezekiel* and *Daniel* are very descrip-
 tive of it, *Ezek.* i. 28. ii. 2. iii. 14, 15. *Dan.* vii. 28.
 viii. 17, 18, ult.

* 1 Sam. iii. xxi. 1. See also chap. ix. 15, 27.

“ handed down to us. Thus was it that
 “ these holy Men of God *spoke*, actuated
 “ (*πνευματοι*) by the Holy Ghost ; and thus
 “ it is, that their Writings are, as St. Paul
 “ expresses it, *θεοπνευστοι*, inspired by God.”

As to Christian Prophecy, it is to be
 observed, that “ as all the Kinds of *Communi-*
 “ *munication from the Deity*, which were
 “ used in the two Dispensations *preceding*
 “ the Gospel, were made use of *during*
 “ the *Establishment* of the Gospel ; so were
 “ all the Sorts or Degrees of *Prophecy*.—
 “ The lower Degrees, *Vision* and *Dream*,
 “ generally relate to *private Conduct* ; with
 “ regard to the Gospel, to *private Revela-*
 “ *tions*, or *distant Events* which should
 “ happen in the Church, and not to *Pro-*
 “ *phesy* as concerned in the *public preach-*
 “ *ing* of the Gospel, and *public Assemblies*
 “ of the Church ; but these, the Gifts of
 “ the Spirit in the public Ministrations of
 “ the Church, are what this Discourse of
 “ the Apostle respects : Now *this Prophecy*,
 “ Prophecy here intended, is that of the
 “ *bighest Degree under the Law of Moses*.
 “ Thus the *Christian Prophets* taught, ex-
 “ *orted*, and *comforted*, as appears from

H

“ the

“ the 3d and 31st Verses of the xivth Chap-
 “ ter, not by *Doctrine*, as the *establisht*
 “ *Teachers* (they succeeded to the *Mosaical*
 “ *Priesthood*) but by *Prophecy*, as *imme-*
 “ *diately inspired* and commissioned there-
 “ to, as did the Prophets of old : They
 “ comforted not only by Exhortation,
 “ but *being filled with the Spirit*, by
 “ *speaking* also in *Psalms*, and *Hymns*,
 “ *and spiritual Songs* *, *instantaneously de-*
 “ *livered* in their public Assemblies.—
 “ They *plainly*, and not by Similitude,
 “ *foretold future Events*.—As *Samuel* and
 “ *Elisba* of old, by God’s especial Com-
 “ mand, appointed Kings ; so did, some-
 “ times, the Christian Prophets † *Ministers*
 “ to the Service of the Gospel.—As they
 “ knew and told what *was done* in secret,
 “ as well as what was *future* ; so did the
 “ Christian Prophets when any Unbelievers
 “ were present, *make manifest to them the*
 “ *Secret of their Hearts* ‡, unknown to all
 “ but God and themselves, discover their

* Compare *Eph. v. 18, 19.* 1 *Cor. xiv. 26.*

† *Acts xiii. 1, 2.* 1 *Tim. xviii. 4, 14, &c.*

‡ 1 *Cor. xiv. 24, 25, 26.*

" secret Designs, their private Actions, and
 " the most hidden Particulars of their Lives;
 " whence, *convicted* in their Conscience,
 " that they were guilty of the Crimes paint-
 " ed by the Prophet, they were forced to
 " acknowledge, that what they saw and
 " heard was the Work of God, and that
 " the Religion, which was attested by Man's
 " telling what it was impossible for *Man* to
 " know, could come only from him."

Such now is the Gift of that Holy Spirit
 of Prophecy, as it was in the Apostles Time
 publicly exercised in preaching the Gospel,
 and in the public Assemblies of the Church.
 The Gift was the same, whether it was be-
 stowed on *Apostles*, on *Evangelists*, or on
 those who spoke by Inspiration in the public
 Assemblies of Christians, and were in a
 more proper and restrain'd Sense called *Pro-*
phets. Thus St. *Paul* tells us, that in the
 Oeconomy which Christ established, when
 he first entered on the Business of his King-
 dom, as Head of the Church, * *When he*
ascended on high, far above all Heavens,
that he might fulfil all Things; he gave some
Apostles, some Prophets, some Evangelists,

* *Eph. iv. 21, 22.*

some Pastors and Teachers; the latter, which are joined together, the ordinary Ministers of the Word; the other three the extraordinary ones, which the Necessities of that Age called for. Here the Prophets are distinguished from the Evangelists: But just before the Evangelists, if we understand thereby those who preached the Gospel to the Unconverted, are called Prophets—

** The Mystery of Jesus Christ, which was not made known to the Sons of Men in other Generations, as it is now revealed to the holy Apostles and Prophets by the Holy Ghost; nay, 'tis thus that Christ himself, as he spoke all that God commanded him, is called a Prophet.*

'Tis the same which St. Paul calls the Mystery of Jesus Christ, or at least a Part of it, which St. Peter, after having set to View the Hope of Christians, speaks of, in much the same manner. To the old Prophets, † To whom the Spirit of Christ testified beforehand the Sufferings of Christ, and the Glory that should follow, searching what or what manner of time the Spirit that was in them did testify||; it was revealed,

• Chap. iii. 5.

† 1 Pet. i. 11.

• || Verse 12.

that not unto themselves, but unto us, they did minister those Things, which are now reported unto you by those who have preached the Gospel unto you by the Holy Ghost sent down from Heaven, which Things the Angels desire to look into. The Things here spoken of, be they what they will, are, however, plainly the Things which were prophesied of before, and preached under the Gospel, but more fully revealed now than before; and 'tis as plain, that the Prophets prophesied, and the Preachers preached, not only the same Things, but by the same Spirit. St. Paul tells us, that the Mystery of Jesus Christ was revealed to the Apostles and Prophets; St. Peter, that the Things he speaks of were reported by those who had preached the Gospel to them by the Holy Ghost. Did now St. Peter preach the Gospel? Was he of the Number of the Apostles and Christian Prophets? Then had he the same Spirit as the old Prophets had, but a clearer and fuller Revelation of the same Truths.

Supposing now, what is supposed by Mr. Cook, that the controverted Words are spoke by the Apostle, to assure Christians

of their Hopes ; does he rest these Hopes *solely* on the old Prophets ? Does he not as well on what was taught by those who preached the Gospel, that is, on Christian Prophecy ? Nay, does he not rest these Hopes *more* on this, as this was a clearer and fuller Revelation ? And yet these are that learned Gentleman's Words, " And " then *," *i. e.* after the animating them with the Hopes before-mentioned, " (what " is most remarkable to my Purpose) for " their Assurance of this Salvation he rests " it not upon his own Authority, as Apostle, " as one commission'd to preach and publish " it,—but refers them wholly to the Pro- " phets; to those, who, *having inquired and " searched diligently into it, prophesied of " this Grace that should come unto them, " and testified beforehand the Glory that " should follow* ||." And then wholly passing over what relates, in the 12th Verse, to those who had preached these Things to them by the Holy Ghost, he in the next Words adds, " The just and strong Conclu- " sion from all which is," tho' this Conclusion immediately follows what he has left

* Sermon, p. 2.

¶ Verse 11.

out,

out, * "*Wherefore gird up the Loins of your
Mind, and hope to the End, for the Sal-
vation that is to be brought unto you at
the Revelation of Jesus Christ.*"

What casts some Obscurity on the inter-
mediate Verse, is the enervate rendering of
the Word ἀγγέλῳ by *reported*. The old
Prophets were undoubtedly Ministers unto
us by their Prophecies of what the Holy
Spirit, which was in them, did beforehand
testify of the Sufferings of Christ, and the
Glories after; and they did minister unto
the Christians St. Peter writes to, *those things
which are now reported unto you by those who
have preached the Gospel unto you*. We may
be led, by the historical Term *reported*, to
suspect, that the historical Facts of Christ's
Sufferings, and the Glories of the Resurre-
ction, and Ascension, and sitting on the
Right-hand of God, may be only meant
thereby. But if we consider, that the
Things which were reported, were *those
Things which Angels desire to look into*, 'tis
evident that *those Things* could not be past
Facts, which the Angels must be well ac-
quainted with, and were in Fact Witnesses

to at the time that they happened, but something future; * *that Salvation of their Souls*, on the mention of which this Solitude of the Prophets, to know what and what manner of time the Holy Spirit intended thereby, is introduced. But the true Sense of this Word ἀναγγέλλω, whenever it is used of promulgating or interpreting a Law, or of Subjects of Revelation, will shew this in a still stronger Light, and give the Place its full Force.

Ἀναγγέλλω, in its first and general Sense, signifies undoubtedly, to *report the Words of one again unto another*, and, from thence, to *relate a Fact*. These are its general Senses, in the general Usage of the Language. But as Words of a general Signification, by being applied technically, as it were, to a particular Subject, admit an Accession of new Ideas, and come to have a *proper* Sense; so it has fared with this Word, as well as with its Kindred ἀγγέλλω and εὐαγγελίζω, in the Sacred Writers: In whom ἀναγγέλλω, when used in its *proper* Sense, is a Term very nervous, and full of Dignity. Thus, when God himself pro-

* Ver. 10.

promulged the Ten Commandments on Mount Sinai *; when *Moses* afterwards, commanded by God, just before his Death, to renew the Covenant of *Horeb*, in the Close solemnly *denounces* their Destruction, should they fall off to Idolatry †; when the Priests, the Levites, and the Judge which should be, on Occasion of any Controversy, after having inquired of the Lord, formally *ex cathedra* interpreted the Law ‡; when God *reveals* any thing to his Prophets, or they from him, and in his Name, *promulge* the same to Man, 'tis ἀναγγέλλειν is the Term ||. When the Spirit, in those Ten Chapters, from the xxxixth to the xlixth of *Isaiab*, displaying, in a manner so full of the Divinity, the Majesty, Omnipotence, and Prescience of God, and setting to Scorn the Impotency of Idols in those respects, so often appeals to his *foretelling former things from the Beginning*, and braves them to do the same, 'tis ἀναγγέλλειν is the stated Term §. I shall only add, with regard to this Term in the *Septuagint*, that when the Preaching of the

* Deut. iv. 13. † Ibid. xxx. 13.

‡ Ibid. xvii. 9, &c.

|| Passim per Propb.

§ *Isaiab* xl. 21. xli. 22. xlii. 9. xliii. 9, 12. xlv. 19, 21. xvi. 10. xviii. 3, 5, 14.

Gospel to the Gentiles is foretold, it is in these Words, ἀναγγεῖλαι τὴν δόξαν μου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι * ; and that it is not Words of one, but several *Hebrew* Roots, which they translate by the same Term. Such is the *proper* Sense of the Word in those Translators. And, suitably to what so often happens, that the Terms of the *Septuagint*, with their proper Notions, are transcribed into the Sacred Books of the *New Testament*, what it is promised in St. *John* †, that the Holy Ghost shall shew to the Apostles, is in the same Term ἀναγγεῖλαι. And when St. *Paul* had not feared to shew the Elders of the Church of *Ephesus* whatever was profitable to them — the whole Will of God ‡, and St. *John* declared the Message which he had heard §, 'tis ἀναγγεῖλαι is the Word. It is an easy Matter therefore to see what St. *Peter* too means by ἀ ὑμῶν ἀκηγγέλη ὑμῖν, not which have been *reported* unto you, but which have been authoritatively promulged, as God's own Interpretation of his former Promises, by those who had received the same Spirit by which they were first de-

* *Isaiah* lvi. 19.† *Acts* xx. 24, 27.‡ *Chap.* xvi.§ *1 Ep.* 4. 5.

livered, and under the Direction of which the Gospel had been preached to them.

You must allow me, my Lord, to pass from this Place of *St. Peter*, to another in the Second Epistle, which his Lordship refers to this; and to which indeed, if what we have just before observed of the long Parenthesis be just, it must necessarily be referred, there being nothing else out of the Parenthesis it possibly can: 'Tis the 2d Verse of the iiii Chapter: "The Words which were spoken before by the holy Prophets, and the Commandment of us the Apostles of the Lord and Saviour;" which in both Epistles he stirs up their pure Minds to be mindful of, more especially considering what they were to expect; "† The Scoffers, who shall come in the last Days, walking after their own Lusts, and saying, Where is the Promise of his Coming?" Here seemsevidently, in the 2d Verse, a Summary of what he had said in the three Verses we have been discussing in his First Epistle. The Words which were spoken before by the holy Propbets, are undoubtedly the short of what is said in

† Ver. 3, 4.

the two first of those three Verses, of the
 “ Prophets who had prophesied beforehand
 “ of the Sufferings of Christ, and of the
 “ Glories which should follow;” as the Com-
 mandment of the Apostles seems to be of
 what is said in the last of them, of the same
 Things, which the *Old* Prophets had fore-
 told, being promulged, as God’s own In-
 terpretation by the *New*, by those who
 preached the Gospel. But Mr. Cook, who
 has intirely left out, in his Narrative of the
 Apostle’s Account of Prophecy, what is said
 in that Verse of Christian Prophecy, is ob-
 liged to find out something else in the First
 Epistle to which this *Commandment* of the
 Apostle’s in the Second must relate; and
 that is, † *those moral or doctrinal Precepts,*
not affecting the Point in Question, which
are diffused thro’ the whole Letter, and in-
deed compose the Body and Substance of it.
 These *Precepts* have the Idea of Plurality so
 closely connected with them, that Mr. Cook
 has, imperceptibly to himself, when he re-
 cites the Words, slipt into the Plural in re-
 citing them. “ The other Branch of St. Pe-
 “ ter’s Discourse is, as he himself states and

† Sermon, p. 14.

“ represents

"represents it, the *Commandments of the Apostles of the Lord and Saviour*," * and he accordingly every-where speaks of them in the Plural. "His whole Doctrine" (after citing the 1st and 2d Verses *verbatim*), "you perceive, is reduced to two Points ||; that they attend to and have *Faith* in Prophecy, and *obey the Instructions* which they had received from the Apostles."

When I read the Words cited in *Italics*, as the Words of the Apostle's Text, in the 14th Page, I imagined the learned Gentleman had done it in consequence of some various Reading he followed; but I find that there is none here, and that all the Copies have, without Variation, *ἐντολὴ* in the Singular; and Mr. Cook, in reciting the Passage at Length, in the 7th Page, has *Commandment*, not *Commandments*. Now tho' *Commandments* may be meant of these *Precepts or Instructions*, yet *Commandment* cannot: For *ἐντολὴ* in the Singular, throughout the Sacred Writings, where it is not meant of any one Precept in particular, signifies Command in general; when applied to the Law of *Moses*, the whole *Mosaic*

* Ibid.

† Page 7, 8.

Dispensation; and when to that of Christ, the Christian, including under it as well the *Credenda* as *Agenda* of Christianity: Nay, St. Paul to Timothy seems not only to include in the Term, the *Dispensation*, but the particular Charge and Commission which Timothy bore under that Dispensation: Where as the Sense which Mr. Cook gives it, is neither that of any one Precept, nor of the whole Law of the Gospel, but of those moral and doctrinal Precepts, not affecting Prophecy, which are contained in St. Peter's first Epistle. Now these could only be expressed by ἐντολαί in the Plural, not by ἐντολή in the Singular. And this, my Lord, I must assume as a thing certain, unless you can shew me any one Place where 'tis us'd in the Singular for several Precepts of Christianity, and yet not for the Whole of it. If this be so, you will allow me to conclude, that the Distribution of the Epistles, founded on this Supposition, is not St. Peter's, but Mr. Cook's; and, without farther Examination, that the Induction from the several Particulars arising from this manner of considering the Epistles, which that learned Gentleman has urged through several

ral Pages, to prove what his Solution rests on, that the Prophecies of the Old Testament are only meant in the more sure Word of Prophecy, is quite ideal, and the Solution itself but a pretty Child of the Imagination.

But though 'tis certain, that what this ingenious Gentleman thinks is meant by the Commandment of the Apostle, *cannot* be meant by it; yet what is the Meaning is far from being clear; nor is the Reading of the Sentence more settled than the Sense of it. In the common Reading τῆς τῶν Ἀποστόλων ἡμῶν ἐνβολῆς, τῷ Κυρίῳ καὶ Σωτῆρι, 'tis most evident from what his Lordship has observed *, that ἡμῶν must be wrong, wrong either in the Word, or the Place of it. But there is a *Reading*, and a *Sense* of ἐνβολῇ not yet mentioned, which seems to me to place this Sentence, and its Connexion with the last of the Verses in the first Chapter, in its full and true Force. The Reading is of a Manuscript of great Authority, the *Alexandrian*; which is followed in some Editions, as particularly in that before me,

* Diff. 1. p. 196.

the Quarto of *Geneva*, 1620. which has ὑμῶν instead of ἡμῶν; and the Sense is vouched by several Places of both Testaments, I mean the prophetic Sense of ἐνβολῇ, for such it has, and is sometimes put for the Charge or Commission by God given to the Prophet, and sometimes for what is delivered by the Prophet under that Commission: So that the ἀπόστολοι ὑμῶν here mean the same as the οἱ εὐαγγελιστοὶ ὑμᾶς there, as the ἐνβολῇ, the Doctrine taught by them, ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι, the ᾧ ἀντηγγέλη, or authenticated Interpretation of the old Prophecies. Indeed nothing else seems necessary to establish this Sense, but to shew that the Words fairly have such a Sense.

When God, in *Horeb*, delivers that Law to *Moses*, which he was to deliver to the Children of *Israel* *, ἐνετείλατο αὐτῷ πρὸς Ἰσραὴλ πρὸς ἀγμάλα, &c. he gave him those Commandments, in Charge, to deliver to *Israel*. The Judgments which God foretold in the Days of old is ῥῆμα, ᾧ οὐ ἐνετείλατο †. When in *Zecbariah* any Prophecies or Regulations are delivered by the

* Matt. iv. 4.

† Lam. ii. 17.

Prophets, God † ἐνέλλεται ἐν πνεύματι τοῖς
 προφήταις, He by his Spirit gives them in
 Charge to his Prophets. The same thing,
 in another Place of the same Prophet ||,
 is expressed, by the Law, and the Words
 which he hath sent (ἐξαπέστειλε), in his Spi-
 rit, by the Prophets. And indeed whoever
 will compare the Expressions which are
 made use of when God gives *Jeremiah* his
 Commission, and when he disavows the
 Mission of the false Prophets in the same
 Book §, he will see ἀποστείλλειν or ἐξαποστεί-
 λειν προφήτην, or ἐνέλλεσθαι προφήτῃ, to be the
 stated Terms of prophetic Mission. They
 are there concomitant, being, as it were, the
 full Form of Mission, but are oftener used
 each by themselves, to express the same
 thing. Hence 'tis that we have in *Malachi*
 ἐνβολή, for what is delivered by a Pro-
 phet under this Mission*. “ And now, O ye
 “ Priests, this Commandment (ἐνβολή) is for
 “ you.” What is here rendered Command-
 ment is not, properly speaking, a Com-
 mandment, but a Denunciation of future
 Judgment, in case they would not give

† Ch. i. 6. || Ch. vii. 12. § Jer. i. 7. xi. 14.
 xiii. 32. * Mat. ii. 1.

Glory to his Name ; in which Case † “ ye
 “ shall know that I have sent this Command-
 “ ment unto you,” διὸ ἐγὼ ἐξαπέσταλκα
 πρὸς ὑμᾶς τὴν ἐντολὴν ταύτην ; they should
 know from the Execution of the Denuncia-
 tion, that it was God who had denounced
 it. I need, my Lord, I think, but add one
 Instance more, That as the Mission of other
 Prophets is designed by ἐνέλλομαι, so is
 that of the great Prophet, of Christ himself,
 for of him God ‡, in *Deuteronomy*, I will put
 my Words in his Mouth, and he shall speak
 unto them all that I shall command him,
 ἐνείλωμαι αὐτῷ, just as in God's Commis-
 sion to *Jeremiah*, Whatsoever ἐνείλωμαι σοι,
 thou shalt speak.

As God, in *Deuteronomy*, says, He would
 give Christ this ἐντολὴ in all that he should
 speak unto them, so Christ himself, in St.
John's Gospel ||, avers, That he had given
 it to him. “ I have not spoken of myself,
 “ but the Father which sent me, he gave
 “ me a Commandment, αὐτὸς μοι ἐντολὴν
 “ ἔδωκε, what I should say, and what I
 “ should speak.” We have here ἐντολὴ for

† Mal. ii. 4.

‡ xviii. 18.

|| xii. 19.

the Direction of what he should speak; in the next Verse for the Doctrine delivered under this Direction. "And I know § that his Commandment, ἡ ἐντολὴ αὐτοῦ, the Doctrine I deliver under his Direction, is Life everlasting" (just as he had said before, "the Words that I speak unto you they are Life," i. e. as they give Life): "Whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak *.

§ John. vi. 63.

* Thus 'tis, as being the Commands of God, and delivered under Inspiration from him, that St. Paul, at the Close of the several Regulations he had been giving concerning the Exercise of the extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit in the Assemblies of the *Corinthians*, says, "If any one thinks himself to be a Prophet, or spiritual" (inspired by the Spirit), "let him acknowledge what the things are which I write unto you, that they are the Commandments (ἐντολαί) of the Lord." 4 *Cor.* xiv. 37. If he has the Spirit himself, he will know these things to be from the Spirit. As he had reason'd before in the 2d Chapter, Ver. 43. But "if any Man be ignorant," if he does not perceive that they are inspired by the Spirit, he has not the Spirit himself, and "let him be ignorant." I mention not this of St. Paul's as an Instance in Point, the Word here being in the Plural, and relating to Commands, properly so called, and not to Doctrines, but to shew that an ἐντολὴ delivered by an Apostle, as under Inspiration, and receiving it from God, is to be looked upon as a Command of God, and the Apostle, as the Prophet by whom God communicates it.

St. *John*, likewise speaking of himself as receiving and giving the *ἐντολὴν*, understands thereby, not properly speaking, a Command, but a Doctrine. In his 1st and 2d Chapter, having been speaking before of that Doctrine of the Christian Faith, that none *know* God, or *abode* in God, but those that keep his Commandments, he saith *, “ I write “ not unto you a new Commandment, *i. e.* “ a new Doctrine, *καὶνὴν ἐντολὴν*, but an “ old Commandment,” an old Doctrine, “ which ye had from the Beginning. Again, “ a new Commandment I write unto you, “ which is true in him, and in you.” And what is this new Commandment which he had not delivered before? Why, another Doctrine, that none is *in the Light*, which hateth his Brother. Again, in his Second Epistle, he has *ἐντολὴν* for the whole Doctrine of Truth, or of the Gospel, which he says, he received from the Father. As St. *John* there uses *ἐντολὴν* for the whole Doctrine of the Gospel, so does St. *Peter* †, at the End of the Parenthesis, when he says, “ It had been better not to have known “ the Way of Righteousness, than, having

* John vi. 7.

† 2 Ep. ii. 21.

“ known

“ known it; to turn from *the holy Commandment*, which had been deliver’d unto “ them;” from it to the Corruption of the false Teachers before spoken of; which consisting both in Faith and Practice, there is no Reason to doubt but he must intend both, when he lays before them the Danger of being seduced by them.

Thus, my Lord, we see, that, by *ἐντολὴ*, may be meant either any particular Precept or Doctrine, or the Complex of both Precepts and Doctrines in the Christian Religion, consider’d as *deliver’d under prophetic Mission*, which enters into and makes Part of the Idea of it. Consequently the *ἐντολὴ ἀποστόλων* may be intended of the Whole or any particular Part of the Christian System, consider’d as *so deliver’d*; and of what it is meant must be determin’d by the Connexion and Relation which any Passage, under Question, has. Now, as the *ἐντολὴ ἀποστόλων*, in this Passage, is connected with the *προειρημένα ρήματα προφητῶν*, which plainly are intended of the Messiah’s Kingdom; and both have an obvious Relation to the three Verses mention’d before, in the First Chapter of the First Epistle; we cannot forbear concluding,

that the ἐντολή must here be limited to that Part of the Christian Doctrine: And as the Words, spoken before of the Prophets, relate to the Prophets there mention'd; so the ἐντολή here, does to the ἀ' ἀγγελίᾳ there.

The Expression of ἀπόστολοι ὑμῶν, and the Construction τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐνταυτῇ, τῷ Κυρίῳ καὶ Σωτῆρι, may possibly appear still to have some Difficulty: But if you consider, my Lord, that as ἀπόστολος, in its general Sense, signifies no more than *one sent on any particular Commission*; so ἀπόστολος, in its prophetic Sense, does *one sent by prophetic Mission*; and 'tis from this that those term'd emphatically οἱ Ἀπόστολοι derive their Title; you will easily resolve ἀπόστολοι ὑμῶν into *those that were sent to reveal the Will of God to you*. The Word admits a Genitive, both of the Person sending, and of the Persons to whom sent; and ἀπόστολος ἰθρῶν, as St. Paul stiles himself, is a sufficient Voucher for the ἀπόστολοι ὑμῶν of St. Peter: If you want an Authority for a Pronoun in the Genitive, *Eraphroditus*'s being call'd by the Apostle, in his Epistle to the *Philippians**, ἀπόστολος ὑμῶν, will, I

* Chap. ii. 15.

presume, be a sufficient one. As to the Construction, a Word preceding, understood before Κυρίου ἡ Σωτῆρος, will make it intirely grammatical. Ἀποστόλων, or ἐντολῶν, will both answer the Purpose; but ἐντολῶν seems more emphatical; so that, at length, it will be, μνησθῆναι—τῆς ἀποστόλων ὁμῆς ἐντολῆς, ἐντολῆς Κυρίου ἡ Σωτῆρος; the Doctrine of your Apostles, that is, the Doctrine of the Lord and Saviour. If you require Authority for this, that of St. Paul to the *Thessalonians**, I presume, will suffice. "We thank God without ceasing," ὅτι παράλαβόντες λόγον ἀκοῆς παρ' ἡμῶν, τῷ Θεῷ, ὡς αὐτοὶ οὐ λόγον ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλὰ καθὼς ἐστὶν ἐληθεὺς λόγον Θεοῦ; where, to fill up the Construction, after παρ' ἡμῶν preceding, λόγον before τῷ Θεῷ is understood.

I doubt not, my Lord, but this Passage of St. Paul, where he avows, that what he taught was not the Word of Men, but of God, at the same time that it explains the Construction of the Expression of St. Peter, will lead you to remind me, that tho' I may have shewn, that the λόγος προφητικός of this

* 1 Thess. ii. 13.

Apostle *cannot* mean the Prophecies of the Old Testament, as the two learned Gentlemen of *Eton* suppose; yet I have not shewn what it *does mean*. This I had not forgot, but 'tis what I am now regularly come to, which I shall enter on, after first observing, that what has been here said of the *ἐπιτολὴ* of the Apostles, does not interfere with what his Lordship advances in his Dissertation on the Genuineness of the 2d Ep. of St. Peter; that the *ἐπιτολὴ* in this Place, has in View some Rescript or Admonition sent, by common Consent of the Apostles, in a Meeting held on Occasion of those *new false* Teachers, to the Churches. For what the Apostles in general should determine, in such a Case, would, undoubtedly, be as much an *ἐπιτολὴ* of God, as what one, or a few of them, should.

From the Account given of Prophecy, as it stood in the former Dispensations of Religion; from the prophetic Sense of ἀναγγέλλειν and ἐπιτολὴ, as traced in the Old Testament and the New; I may, I think, say 'tis evident, that those who had receiv'd the *ἐπιτολὴ* for preaching the Gospel, and the Apostles, in particular, ἀντισηλας, did
pro-

promulge and publicly declare the Doctrine they taught, *by the Holy Ghost*; and that what they so taught was the *ἐντολή* of God, deliver'd to them in that kind of Prophecy which was the highest under the Law; and that whatever Interpretation they, under this Mission, gave of the old Prophecies, was given by the same Spirit which first inspir'd them: And if other Apostles and Evangelists had this Word of Prophecy, your Lordship will, I am sure, allow, St. Peter had, and therefore *could* appeal to it for the Certainty of what he had taught his Disciples concerning the future Coming of *Christ* his Master. Now this, I say, he *has* done; and that this is what he means by *ὁ λόγος προφητικός*, or the Word of Prophecy, which he had. That he, in Fact, had it, has been shewn; that he means it in this Place, remains to be shewn; which only can be done by evincing, that this is the stated Sense of the Word, and that the Sense is fully accommodated, and gives Light, to the whole Passage.

The Derivatives of *Amar*, and *Dabar*, in the Sense of Speaking, are, in the Original, generally made use of to express that highest Species

Species of Prophecy in which God is said to speak to his Prophets, as 'tis distinct from symbolical Revelation by the Vision and the Dream, the inferior Sorts: And λόγος, and its synonymous ῥήμα, tho' the former is much the more usual, are the Terms made use of, by the *Greek* Translators, to render those Derivatives by, as well as sometimes Derivatives from other Radixes, when they are employ'd to express the same Thing. Thus they become Terms *proper* to the Subject, and express both the prophetic *Impulse* in that Manner of Communication from the Deity, and *what is thus delivered* under that Impulse; the former always without Exception in the Singular, and the latter often so too, where a single Prophecy is meant; tho' 'tis not unusual to speak of a single Prophecy in the Plural; but where Prophecies, more than one, are meant, and not the Impulse and Manner, 'tis always, as was observ'd before, in the Plural, λόγοι, or ῥήματα.

Thus the Prophet *David**, 'The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, ἐν ἑμοί; and his 'Word,' his Impulse, in this Manner of Prophecy, "was in my Tongue. The God of

* 2 Sam. xxiii. 2, 3.

"*Israel said, the Rock of Israel spake to me.*"
 Thus ῥῆμα Κυρίου, * the Word of the Lord,
 was precious in the Days of *Samuel*; there
 was no open Vision; † ἐγενήθη ῥῆμα Κυρίου
 πρὸς Σαμουὴλ, the Word of the Lord came,
 as we render it, to *Samuel*; and so—^b to
Nathan—^c to *Elijah*, or by the Hand of
 ‡ ἐν χειρὶ Ἡλίου—to, or upon *Jeremiah*—^d ἐν
 † ἱσραήλ. So λόγος Κυρίου came to *Gad*
 † ἐγένετο πρὸς Γαδ—^e to *Solomon*—^f to the
 Prophet—^g to *Nathan*—^h to *Shemaiah*—
 † to *Jeremiah*, or the Word from the Lord,
 παρὰ Κυρίου—ⁱ to *Isaiab*—^j to *Ezekiel*—
 to *Hosea*, and so of the lesser Prophets, ge-
 neraly. We have also, in the other Form
 of Speech, by the Hand of *Jebu*—^k ἐγένετο
 λόγος Κ. ἐν χειρὶ τῆς—^l of *Haggai*.

In like manner, as acting under this Im-
 pulse, the Prophet is frequently said to come,
 to speak, to do, ἐν λόγῳ, or ἐν ῥήματι Κ.
 or Θεοῦ; and so it was commanded *Moses*, † ἐν
 λόγῳ Θεοῦ. In all these Places, the Impulse,

* 1 Sam. iii. 1. † 2 Sam. vii. 4. † 1 Kings
 xviii. 1. † 1 Sam. xv. 10. † Jer. i. 1. † 2 Sam.
 xiv. 12. † Ib. xxi. 28. † Ib. xiii. 20.
 † 1 Kings vi. 11. † Chr. vii. 3. † Jerem. passim.
 † 2 Chr. xii. 7. † Isa. ii. 1. † 1 Kings xvi. 1.
 † Hag. i. 1. † Ezek. passim. † Cron. xv. 15.

or Inspiration by the Holy Spirit in that Form of Prophecy which was called λόγος, is meant. Thus in *Jeremiah**, those that would not hearken to his Denunciation say, "The Law shall not perish from the Priest, nor Counsel from the Wise, nor the Word, λόγος, from the Prophet." It is very observable in *Ezekiel*, where there are several Revelations by Vision, and many more by the Word of the Lord, that the manner of Expression is always different. Wherever there is a Vision, 'tis, The Hand of the Lord was upon me (ἐγέρθη ἐπ' ἐμὴν χεὶρ Κυρίου); where the Revelation was by the Word, 'tis, The Word of the Lord came to me, saying (ἐγέρθη ὑπὸς μὲ, λέγων). After having said in the First Verse of the First Chapter, *The Heavens were opened, and I saw Visions of God*, he proceeds to relate a Scene of Vision intermixed with the Word; and the manner of Expression in the Introduction to it is, The Word of the Lord came expressly unto *Ezekiel*—and the Hand of the Lord was upon him, v. 3. And as the Vision is always introduced with *The Hand of the Lord was upon me*, so is the Word always with *The*

* Chap. xviii. 18.

Word of the Lord came unto me, as well when it came to him in Vision, as not in Vision. It seems to be this Species of Prophecy too, as distinct from Vision, which Hosea distinguishes from it, when God says in him, * "I have also spoken to the Prophets" (λαλήσω πρὸς προφῆτας), and I have multiplied *Visions, and used Similitudes*, by the "Ministry (ἐν χειρὶ) of the Prophets." For in this manner of Prophecy God is said to *Speak to the Prophets* (λαλήσαι πρὸς Προφῆτας), or commonly (ἐν χειρὶ) by the Ministry of the Prophets †. The solemn Form of Promulging is, Τὰς λέγει Κύριος, What I am going to say, the Lord saith; or, Thus saith the Lord; and the awakening to Attention, is, Hear the Word ῥῆμα, λόγον K. Hence is it, that what is delivered by the Prophets under this Impulse, is so often called λόγος K. the Word of the Lord. Such is the Word of Prophecy, the λόγος προφητικός, i. e. προφητῶν or προφητείας in the Old Testament. Let us now follow it from this its Source into the New.

* Hos. xii. 10.

† 1 Kings xvi. 12. Ib. xiv. 8. xvi. 7, & passim.

We have before shewed the *Thing*, that the Apostles, &c. had, the highest Degree of Prophecy which was under the former Dispensations; our Business now is with the *Term* peculiar to this Kind. With regard to the *Thing delivered* under such Impulse or Inspiration, it is found every-where in the New Testament in that Notion. In the Old Testament the Law of *Moses* is frequently termed ὁ λόγος Κυρίου; and in the New, the stated Term for expressing the Law of Christ, the Whole of the Christian Doctrine, is ὁ λόγος τοῦ Κυρίου, ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, or simply and emphatically ὁ λόγος, *the Word*; as from the Subject, the Nature, and Effects of the Doctrine, ὁ λόγος τοῦ σταυροῦ, &c. the Word of the Cross, of the Kingdom of Grace, of Truth, of the Gospel, of the Covenant, of Reconciliation, of Life, &c. and this always emphatically with the ὁ, ὁ λόγος. And hence it is, that as the * Law of *Moses* is sometimes in it called the Oracles (λόγια) of God, so is the † Doctrine of Christ. In the like manner, tho' not so frequently, are ῥήματα and ῥῆμα used for the Things thus

* Acts vii. 38. Rom. iii. † Heb. v. 12.

delivered.

delivered. Our Lord, speaking of himself, says ||, "He whom God has *sent*, ἀπο-
 "σταλens, speaketh the Words," τὰ ῥήματα
 τοῦ Θεοῦ λαλῶ; and *Peter* of him *, "Thou
 "hast the Words (ῥήματα) of eternal Life."
 And thus it is that St. *Paul* calls the
 Gospel † ῥῆμα πίστεως, the Word of Faith.

The Use of λόγος and ῥῆμα for the Im-
 pulse or *Inspiration* of the Holy Spirit in this
 Form of Prophecy, is not so common as it
 is for the Thing delivered under such Inspi-
 ration. Here, as the very Form of Initia-
 tion into the Christian Religion was in the
 Name of the Father, Son, and *Holy Ghost*;
 as the *Graces* of the Holy Spirit, extraor-
 dinary of those Ages, and ordinary in all
 Ages, are one of the great Promises of the
 Gospel; and his *Descent* and visible Mission
 was testified by a Miracle of so much *Eclat*,
 as that of the Pentecost; Πνεῦμα, or Πνεῦμα
 ἅγιον, is much more generally used than
 ὁ λόγος, or λόγος or ῥῆμα Κυρίου. Indeed
 the same Form of Expression of πνεῦμα
 Κυρίου for the Spirit of Prophecy, is very
 frequent in the Old Testament; and the
 Spirit of the Lord, or of God, is said to

|| *John* iii. 34. * *Mat.* vi. 43. † *Rom.* x. 8.

come or fall upon the Prophet *וְיָבֹא הַרוּחַ*
עָלָיו—to be upon him *וְיָבֹא הַרוּחַ*
עָלָיו, or *וְיָבֹא הַרוּחַ*—to be in him *וְיָבֹא*
הַרוּחַ—to speak to him; and God to give,
 or put of his Spirit upon him—to pour
 out of his Spirit upon him; and the Pro-
 phet to have the Spirit—or be in the Spirit.
 The Difference between this Form of Ex-
 pression, and that of *וְיָבֹא הַרוּחַ* and *וְיָבֹא*
הַרוּחַ seems to be, that as the latter is used of the
 highest Species of Prophecy, and is proper to
 it; under the former is meant Prophecy in
 general, and it is applied to all or any of the
 Species of it. Thus God in *Joel* says, “I
 “ will pour out of my Spirit upon all Flesh,
 “ and your Sons and your Daughters shall
 “ *prophecy*; your young Men shall see Vi-
 “ sions, and your old Men shall dream
 “ Dreams; and upon my Servants, and
 “ upon my Handmaids, in those Days, I
 “ pour out of my Spirit, and they shall
 “ prophesy.” In like manner, in the New
 Testament, the Holy Spirit is said to come or
 fall upon the Person—to be upon him—
 and God to give him his Spirit—and the
 inspired Person to come, or be, or speak in
 the Spirit, or to have the Spirit. But
 not-

notwithstanding the Scriptures of the New Testament speak of Inspiration or Prophecy in these Terms, which are common to it with the Old, and in several others of its own; yet it is to be remarked, that the most usual of them is that which is so well fitted to express that highest Degree, the λόγος, as distinct from the lower, the being filled, or full of the Spirit, a Term I think never made use of but when the extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit are understood. And accordingly, suitably to the Idiom of the Gospel, the *Holy Spirit* is said to speak or say a Thing, which in the Language of the Old Testament is, *The Lord said*, or *spoke*; as there the Form of introducing the Prophecy is, *The Lord saith* (ταὐτε λέγει Κύριος) or *Hear the Word of the Lord*; *Agabus's* is, ταὐτε λέγει τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, *Thus saith the Holy Ghost*; and in the Revelations, 'tis † *Hear what the Spirit saith*. But notwithstanding there is so much Reason for the Idiom of the New Testament thus varying in general from that of the Old, in the Terms by which the Impulse or Inspiration

* *Mat.* xxi. 11. † *Ib.* ii. 7. & *passim*.

of the Prophecy is expressed, yet the *ῥῆμα* and *λόγος* are in some Places retained. The Word of the Lord came to the * Baptist *Ἐγγέλτο ῥῆμα Θεοῦ ἐπὶ Ἰωάννῃ*; and St. Paul, when he assures the *Thessalonians*, that Christ at his coming should bring those that had died in his Faith with him, adds, to give the proper Weight to the Assurance, † “For this I say by the Word of the Lord,” *ἐν λόγῳ Κυρίου*.

Nothing more I think can be wanting, but to shew St. Peter's own Use of the Word: And memorable is his Use of it in his First Epistle, where, after saying, that || “Christians
“ are born again not of corruptible Seed, but
“ of incorruptible, by the Word of God (*ῥῆμα*
“ *λέγει*) which liveth and abideth for ever,” he introduces a Passage of *Isaiab* verbatim from the *Septuagint*, very apposite to what he had said of the corruptible Seed: “For
“ all Flesh is as Grass, and all the Glory of
“ Man as the Flower of Grass. The Grass
“ withereth, and the Flower thereof fadeth
“ away; but the Word of the Lord (*ῥῆμα*)
“ endureth for ever.” And then adds,

* *Luke* iii. 2. † *Ep.* iv. 15. † *Ch.* i. 23.

“ And

"And this is τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ εὐαγγελισθεῖν ἐν ὑμῖν,
 "the Word which has been preach'd unto
 "you." Here we have both λόγος, and ῥῆμα,
 for what is deliver'd, ἐν λόγῳ Κυρίου, or by
 the Impulse of the highest Order of Pro-
 phesy, and the Doctrine of the Gospel de-
 clar'd to be such λόγος, or ῥῆμα, the very
 same Thing which he had said a few Verses
 before in the Gospel Idiom; that what
 εὐαγγελισθεῖν, had been preach'd to them, con-
 cerning the Prophecies of the Old Testa-
 ment, by the Preachers of the New, was ἐν
 ᾧ λόγῳ Πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ. So again, in the next Chap-
 ter, where he abounds, even more than usual,
 in Citations from the *Septuagint*, or Terms
 that allude to Passages in it, he says*, that
 those who were disobedient to it, and be-
 lieved not, stumbled at the Word προσκολλησάμενος
 τῷ λόγῳ, alluding to the Stone of Stumbling,
 and Rock of Offence, of *Isaiah*, just before
 mentioned †. In the same Sense he has it,
 in the next Chapter, where Wives, that
 were Believers, are injoin'd Subjection to
 unbelieving Husbands; that if any obey not
 the Word, τῷ λόγῳ, they may, without the
 Word ἀνευ λόγου, i. e. without the Preaching

* ill 8. † viii 14.

of the Word (in which Sense it is also often used), be won by the Conversation of the Wives. I will not add what follows there, Seeing your chaste Conversation *in the Word*, *καὶ ἐν λόγῳ ἀγνὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν*, as *Clement Alexandrinus* * read the Passage, and with Advantage to it; because none of the present Copies admit of it, which have all, instead of it, *ἐν φόβῳ*. And as other Writers of the New Testament express the Doctrine of the Gospel by *λόγια*, or Oracles; so does St. *Peter* speaking of the Office or Charge of Teaching in the Church, as distinct from that of the Deacon, or he that *ministred*, "If any Man speak, let him speak as the "Oracles of God†." I know, indeed, of no Place, but that under Consideration, in which he uses it for the *Impulse* and *Inspiration* of this sort of Prophecy, tho' he has, in one short Epistle, so often us'd it for *what is deliver'd under that Inspiration*: But as he has evidently us'd it for one Part of the prophetic Sense of *ὁ λόγος*, in the Singular; and as, in this Place, it cannot, in that Sense, be us'd of the Doctrine of the Gospel in general, which all Christians had, as well as

* Pæd. l. iii. 11. P. G. 250. † 1 Ep. iv. 11.

he, and therefore could not be possibly urg'd as an Advantage which he had above them; and as any Number of Prophecies of the Old Testament, which always are spoken of in the plural Number, cannot be spoken of here, the singular being us'd; it remains, that it must be meant, in this Place of *St. Peter*, in the very same Sense as it is in *St. Paul*, in the same Subject, of the Coming of *Christ*.

You must indulge me one Observation more, my Lord; that no Expression, of the same Import, could so well have answer'd the Apostle's Intention here, as the ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος, in the Sense of this Impulse or Inspiration, that of the highest Degree under the Dispensation of *Moses*. If he had made use of the πνεῦμα προφητείας, it would have been too general, and not expressive of the λόγος in particular; if he had, with *St. Paul*, said, I have the *Spirit of God* (ἔχομεν πνεῦμα Θεοῦ), it would have been liable to the same Objection: Besides, neither would have express'd that which *St. Peter* designs here to express, that he had the same λόγος, which the Prophets of the highest Order, in the *Jewish Church*, had; those Prophets whose Mission they acknowledg'd, and whose

Prophecies they receiv'd with the highest Veneration, as the *Word of God*, and of the Veracity of which they could entertain no Doubt: For Doubt, with them, could only take place with regard to the Meaning of the Prophecies, and not the Certainty of the Things intended to be foretold thereby; the Completion being most surely to be depended on, when, what the Prediction is, is known. By the Use of this Term, he reminds them, that in what he had made known unto them of the Coming of *Christ*, and in giving the Interpretation he had done of the Meaning of the Prophecies of their Prophet relating thereto; he had spoken by the very same Impulse and Inspiration which they had. And thus they were assur'd of what they could only possibly be in doubt of before; the Meaning of those Prophecies. This, my Lord, seems to be the Reason of St. Peter's making use of an Expression, here, which is no where else made use of in any of the Sacred Writers, of either Testament; there being no other Expression so expressive of his Meaning, as this.

From the *Word of Prophecy*, in this Sense, the Transition will be natural to its being

more

more sure; another Term of Altercation. The Sum of Mr. Cooke's Objection to his Lordship's Reference and Interpretation of these Words, which, much to Mr. Cooke's Honour, is done in Terms of great Defe-
 "rence, is, that the Construction of the Sen-
 "ences here, "is not such as it probably would
 "have been, had St. Peter's Intention been
 "what his Lordship supposes."—That he
 "does not see how it "can be accommodated
 "to the Force of the Word *BeCause*; be-
 "cause St. Peter cannot be supposed to say,
 "that any other Evidence whatever, in any
 "Respect, or for any Purpose, was *firmer*,
 "or *better grounded*, than his own *Eye-sight*
 "Evidence: And yet the Force of his own
 "Expression will oblige him to say this, if
 "he be suppos'd, on any Account, to com-
 "pare the Prophecies with the Miracle, and,
 "upon the Comparison, to give the Prefer-
 "ence to Prophecy."

As to the first, † "Had St. Peter intended
 "any thing of Comparison or Opposition,
 "he would, probably, have taken care to
 "insert some disjunctive or adversative Par-
 "ticle, which might distinguish his Mean-

* P. 12.

† P. 32.

“ing, and prevent Ambiguity.” But the whole Context here is adversative, from *ἀλλὰ*, in the 16th Verse, to the *ἔ* *προφητικὸν λόγον* in the 19th; of which, what relates to the more sure Word of Prophecy, and to the Transaction in the Mount, are Parts: And no Man knows better than Mr. *Cooke*, that, in an adversative Sentence, if it consists of Parts, those several Parts, according as they are *all together* taken into the Opposition, or *each* of them *separately*, must be connected by *conjunctive* or *disjunctive* Particles; and that, if the Preference is given, in the Opposition, to one more than another, there is no need of any *fresh* adversative Particle. Now the Opposition, here, is between *οὐ σιγουσμένοις μύθοις ἐξακολουθήσαντες* and *something past*, *ἱστορίας γενηθέντες*, &c. his having been an Eye and Ear-witness of what pass'd in the Mount; and *something present*, *ἵχομεν βεβαιώτερον ἔ* *προφητικὸν λόγον* and these *two Parts*, what respected something past, and something present, which, *together*, form the adversative Member of the Period from *ἀλλὰ*, are, in full grammatical Propriety, coupled with the *ἔ*; *ἀλλὰ ἱστορίας γενηθέντες—ἔ ἵχομεν*. The former,
and

and what is subjoin'd to the latter Part of the Sentence, is too long to admit of *ἑξῆς*; and therefore the Verb is made use of, instead of the Participle: But if this be any Objection, it lies as strongly against Mr. Cooke's Connexion, which is, likewise, between a Participle and a Verb, *γερουσίας*—*ἡ ἐξουσία*, &c. Now this Part of the adversative Sentence, "And this Voice we heard," &c. which expresses his being an Ear-witness of the Attestation of *Christ's* Character, as the Messiah, is, by the Nature of it, and the *ταύτην* in it, coupled to what is said of his having been an Eye-witness of his Majesty, and, jointly with it, respect the same Miracle, the same *past* Transaction; a Voice came from the excellent Glory, and this Voice we heard. Thus is the Connexion of the Parts of the *past* Transaction as obviously what the Nature of the Thing requires, as it is grammatical, and the whole Construction consonant to such an Intention as his Lordship supposes.

My Objection to Mr. Cooke's Division of this adversative Sentence, who makes but two Members of it, what relates to the Testimony of the Eyes, and then of the Ears, and

and absorbs what is spoken of as *present*, in the last Member of *the past*, is, not that 'tis *new*, but that 'tis really what he object to his Lordship's, *defective in the Expression*, there seeming to be an *Ita*, or some such Word, in order to avoid Ambiguity, wanting, to express that it was *by the means of* the hearing this Voice that he had the Word of Prophecy made more sure. But, what is still of more Weight with me is, that Mr. Cook supposes, that the two Copulatives, " *2. Ver. 18. and 2. Ver. 19.* *καὶ ταύτην τὴν φωνὴν ἡμεῖς ἀκούσαμεν καὶ τὸ ῥῆμα ἐβεβήκαμεν.* " connects the two Clauses together, and unites them "into one Sentence:" And, accordingly, he translates it, "And this Voice, which came from Heaven, we heard, when we were with him in the holy Mount, and here the Word of Prophecy made more sure." If so, the Word of Prophecy, being made more sure, must be restrain'd to only *one* of the two Parts of the Transactions on the Mount, the Attestation of the Voice: But, supposing this Mention of the Affair of the Mount to be introduced in order to shew, that what he had been honour'd with there,

• P. 19. and *τὸ ῥῆμα ἐβεβήκαμεν* of the Eyes, and then of the P. 17. gave

"gave him a stronger Evidence of *Christ's*
 "Power, and a firmer Dependence on the
 "Certainty of his Coming, than he could
 "have had before, from the Prophecies
 "alone;" can it be conceiv'd, that the
 Apostle would not have taken in the Glori-
 fication, *as well as* the Attestation, into the
 Means by which he had receiv'd a stronger
 Evidence? And if he does, and $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\epsilon\chi\alpha\mu\epsilon\upsilon$
 $\beta\epsilon\beta\alpha\iota\tau\epsilon$ $\tau\epsilon$ $\pi\rho\epsilon\lambda\epsilon$ refers to *both*, as the Means,
 as Mr. *Cooke* supposes at the same time;
 then the Division of what depends on the
 $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$, will be the same as we have laid down
 before; no new Pointing can be introduced,
 and the Sentences of the Eye and Ear-Testi-
 mony will, together, form the first Part; and
 that of the Word of Prophecy, the last: But
 then there will be no Word to express the
 Relation which the latter has to the former,
 as the *Means* of the surer Evidence, which
 yet is absolutely necessary. For the $\kappa\alpha\iota$ alone
 signifies only the Relation in general of the
 latter to the former, as a *joint Part* of the
 Whole in the adverbative Sentence, and not
 that of one as a *Means* of the other. Nor
 do I see how it will help the Case, if we do
 not take the Miracle and the Prophecy col-
 lectively,

lectively, as forming but one Proof; but, consider " them as two distinct Proofs, and " refer the Miracle, singly, to the evidencing " his Power, and leave his Coming to de- " pend wholly on Prophecy." For if " the " Prophecies, having been verified in one " Instance, the Display of his Power, " *strengthens the Ground* of our Assurance " for expecting their Accomplishment in " the other, his Coming;" the former is still but the Means of the latter; and this Relation of the Means must be *express'd*, and not *suppos'd*.

As to Mr. Cooke's other Objection to his Lordship's Interpretation; that " St. Peter " cannot be suppos'd to say, that any other " Evidence whatever, in any Respect, or " for any Purpose, was *firmer*, or better " grounded, than his own Eye-sight Evi- " dence," and which, indeed, is common to him with Mr. Ashton; I must own, I was not a little surpris'd at it, as both suppose his Lordship to have made the Word of Prophecy a surer Evidence to a Man, than the Attestation of his own Senses. I could not easily conceive, that *his Lordship* should say

this; nor could I remember, tho' I had read that Discourse with all the Attention which a Work, wrote in so masterly a Manner, naturally engages, that he *had* said it. I was the more struck, when I read in Mr. *Ashton*, as the Bishop's own Words, that "St. Peter" manifestly compares the Evidence of Prophecy to the Attestation of the Apostles, "who deliver'd what they had heard and seen with their own Eyes and Ears;" but, on turning to the Place, I found his Lordship's Words to be, "He manifestly compares the Evidence of Prophecy to the Evidence arising from the Glorification of Christ, attested by those who deliver'd what they had heard and seen with their own Eyes and Ears." How different his Lordship here, in Mr. *Ashton*'s Words, from what he is in his own! what a mighty Alteration does the inadvertent Change of the Evidence, arising from the Fact attested, into the Attestation itself, make! The Fact, which the Apostle was an Eye and Ear-witness of, was, the Glorification, &c. and of what was the Evidence, arising from the Fact, to be an Evidence? Why, of another,

a future Fact, *Christ's coming again in Power and Glory*; as his Lordship, in another Passage, before cited from him by Mr. *Aston*, expressly says. Now tho' St. Peter could not be made surer of any *past* Event, which he himself had heard and seen by Prophecy, than by his own Ears and Eyes; yet why might not Prophecy be a better Assurance of *another*, a *future* Event, than what he himself had seen or heard? He could entertain no Doubt of the Fact; but the Evidence arising from thence, of the *future* Event, might be very doubtful, at least not so *firm*, or *well-grounded*, as the Evidence arising from Prophecy: For the Certainty of the Fact is nothing at all to the Certainty of a Conclusion to be drawn from the Fact, when the *Justness* of the Conclusion is only consider'd. And thus, my Lord, that is, in his Lordship's Sense, may the * "Apostle be sup-
 "pos'd to say, in his own Person, that the
 "Prophecies carry'd a *better-grounded* Evi-
 "dence [of the future Power and Coming
 "of *Christ*] with them to himself, or rested
 "upon a *more sure Foundation* for his own
 "Belief, than that most illustrious Miracle,

"which he had seen with his own Eyes."

Mr. *Coake*, not satisfy'd with the vague and loose Sense of the *English* Term *sure*, proposes^t that the more sure Word of Prophecy should be render'd *more assur'd*, more confirm'd, and ascertain'd; and accordingly translates *ἐπισημαίνω* Behaviours *πρόβλεψις* *ἰσχυρὰ* *ἔλεος*, and have the Word of Prophecy made more sure. As to our *English* Word *sure*, it appears to me, in the general Use of it, not to be so loose and vague as Mr. *Coake* imagines; for I think we have only two Senses of it: One, when apply'd to a Person; another, when apply'd to a Thing. In the former Case it signifies, with its Verb, being assur'd, or having no Doubt of; in the latter, that which may be rely'd or depended on. Thus, when I say, I am sure of a Thing, I mean, that I have a full Assurance, that I have no Doubt of it; when I say, a Thing is sure, 'tis the same as if I was to say, that it may be depended on as a Thing certain. Here 'tis apply'd to Prophecy; and the obvious Notion of it is, a Word of Prophecy that may be more rely'd on, for the Coming of *Christ*, than that

which it is compar'd with. Now, *sure*, in *this Sense*, it seems, to me, to want no Mending; nay, indeed, to mean the *very same Thing* as Mr. Cooke's propos'd Alteration, unless by more assur'd, or made more sure, he understands it in a passive Sense, in which I doubt whether the Use of the original Word will bear him out: And, indeed, when he comes to the Explication of *βίβω*, he seems to do it in its neutral Sense; neither including Action, or Passion, in the Idea of it.

The Sense he has given us of it, from the Greek Lexicographers, is, undoubtedly, just; but their Explication of it seems to be drawn from its Etymology, as a Derivative from *βίβω*, the Preterperfect of *βαίω*, to go; which, just as *vixit*, in the Latin, for *mortuus est*, signifies what *has* gone, and is now fix'd and settled. We have Instances of *βίβω*, in this its primitive Sense, and some of it in a tralatitious one; but none of the Lexicographers, antient or modern, which I have seen, have any Example of *βίβω*, in its *first* Sense, for a Thing firm and fix'd in its Place, tho' St. Paul's *ἀρχαία ἀσφάλει* & *βεβαία* affords one: And, indeed, it seems

to have the same Sense, where-ever it is us'd in that Epistle. We have Plenty of it in its translated Notion, from *local* Stability to other Things : Under this Notion, it signifies either permanent, or lasting ; or, when apply'd to Things, either what *makes sure* or assures, or what *is sure*, and to be depended on*. In its metaphorical Sense it is indisputably us'd in this Sentence of St. *Peter*, and in which, is to be determin'd, not from the Idea of *local Stability* in the primitive Sense of it, which is *common* to all ; but from the Context, from St. *Peter's* Use of the Word, and the Use of it in the *Sacred* † *Writers*.

In

* When this is applied to *Persons* in this Sense, it signifies one who *is depended* upon, as well as one to be *safely depended* on.

† The *Sense* of it here, be it which of them it will, may be express'd by a Word proper to that Sense, if the Language affords such a one ; nay, *is better* express'd by it : If, indeed, the Design is to give the Surprise of Wit to the Expression, Metaphor will do better, as it will strike in proportion to the Newness and Beauty of the Metaphor ; but, then, the vague Translation from the proper to other Ideas, must be reduced to *one determinate Sense*, and shew'd to mean the same as the proper Term for it, before any Use can be made of it in any *certain* Sense. 'Tis not, therefore, so much,

L

whence

In the Sense, therefore, of βίβας, for that

whence the Term βίβας derives its Sense; as what the Sense, here, of it is, that we are concern'd with; and if that was fully express'd before by *sure*, the Criticism from the primitive Sense of βίβας does, in Effect, however, answer no other good Purpose, but to shew the World what all the World, who knew him, knew before, Mr. Cooke's Learning. If, indeed, a Word can be found, in our Language, which, having the same *primitive* Sense with βίβας, is us'd, too, in the same *translative* Sense; it, undoubtedly, ought to be preferr'd: But great Care should be taken, in all these Cases, that we are not so tenacious of the *former*, as to lose in it the *latter*. Something like this seems to have happen'd to this learned Gentleman himself, who, in his Inquiry into the Meaning of βίβας, in order to preserve its primitive Notion of Stability, having chang'd a more sure Word of Prophecy into a *better-grounded, better-establish'd*, was led to translate it *made more sure*, and to consider the Miracle of the Mount as the *Means* by which it was *made* so. And tho' Mr. Cooke has translated it thus, there is not one of the Places, which he cites from the New Testament to prove the Sense of the Word, in which it is us'd for *made sure*. 'Tis obvious, that, when St. Peter exhorts his Christians, in the same Chapter, to make, *πείθεσθαι*, their Calling and Election sure; he cannot mean it to *make* it *made* sure. In 2 Cor. i. 6. *ἵνα* is as plainly understood; in Rom. iv. 17. it is express'd; and in the *Hebrews* it is καὶ δεχομεν βίβας μετὰ τῶν, let us hold it *fast*, as 'tis very properly render'd, to the End.

which

which makes sure, or is sure*, as the Word of Prophecy is a Thing sure or certain, we are to look for it here. The Apostle had made known to his Disciples the Power and Coming of Christ.—He assures them, that in doing this he had not been the Tool of crafty Impostors, and *followed* cunningly-devised Fables : *But* that he *had* been an Eye-witness of that Majesty which Christ *now* enjoys with the Father, and an Ear-

* When our Apostle, a few Verses before, calls upon Christians to make their Calling and Election sure, *βεβαιον*, by performing the Conditions on which the exceeding great and precious Promises were made, it should seem as if *βεβαιον* here might be taken in the Sense of Permanent or Lasting ; and when we consider that the Transaction of the Mount was but scenic and momentary, that the Word of God endureth for ever, we may be led to think that this may be the Meaning of the Word of Prophecy, here, being *βεβαιωσις*, i. e. more permanent than the Scene of the Mount : But as Proof or Evidence, either to himself or others, is plainly here understood, it is to be remembered, that, however transient the Act itself of Vision and Hearing was, the Evidence arising thence was permanent and lasting, and therefore it cannot admit of Comparison in this respect. Besides, it is not the Word of God delivered that is here meant by the Word of Prophecy, but the Impulse or Inspiration of that Word.

witness of his being recogniz'd as Messiah by God himself, whence that Coming was probable; and that he *now has* what gives him a firmer Assurance of it, or what may be more certainly relied on, as having in its Nature a greater Evidence of that Coming he had made known unto them, that is, the same Revelation of it from God himself, as had their Prophets, who had foretold the Glories of the Messiah's Kingdom, and under which Revelation, in the same Holy Spirit in which they delivered those Prophecies, he had interpreted them to them, when he had shewn that they did refer to that State of Things which was to commence from that Coming. You will observe, my Lord, that it comes pretty much to the same, whether we take the *βεβαιότερον* in its *active* Sense, as that which *gives* the Apostle himself the *greater Assurance*, or in its *passive*, as the unfortunately learned *Stephens* calls it, tho' it seems to be rather a neutral Sense, as that which is to *be more relied on* for it. The active Sense may perhaps seem better suited to the Apostle, as considered *delivering* the Evidence he himself *had* for what he had taught them, in

Oppo-

Opposition to his being *imposed* on ; but it has no Authority in *St. Peter*, or any of the sacred Writers, who employ the Participle of *βεβαιω* for that Purpose : But the neutral or passive Sense is used in several Places, and by *St. Peter* himself most probably just before, in the *making their Calling and Election sure*, certainly to be relied on, such as, attended with Holiness, they might without all doubt depend on for obtaining the Promises : Besides, *St. Peter's* Conviction of the Truth of what he had taught, from that which had a sure Evidence in it, must needs be as strong in Opposition to his being imposed on, as merely the bare Conviction he had ; and if we look forward as well as backward, we shall find, that what is certainly to be relied on, as carrying with it convincing Evidence, is a much properer Transition to exhorting them to attend to it, than urging his own Conviction only.

Thus I think, my Lord, *βεβαιω* here must be taken in that Sense of it, which signifies what is *sure*, certainly to be relied on ; and that the Apostle's Meaning is, that for the Doctrine he had taught them concerning Christ's future Coming, he had the

Evidence arising from what he himself had seen and heard, and also, what was a surer Proof of it, *the Word of Prophecy*. And I am sure, that Mr. *Cooke* will readily allow, that an Evidence for a Thing future, from the *Revelation of God himself*, attested by so many and great Miracles as St. *Peter* wrought, is a *sure* one, and in full Assurance to be relied on ; or in his own Manner of Expression, a *well-grounded Evidence* to himself, to others ; and a *sure Foundation* for others as well as his own Belief ; and that such an Evidence is *better grounded*, and a *more sure Foundation* for such Belief of a Thing to come, than *any Inference or Proof* from the Evidence of a Man's own Eyes and Ears. The *Fact* attested is one Thing, the *Inference* from it to *something future* another, of quite another Nature : If so, and the Meaning of the λόγος προφητικός be such as has been shewn by the Deduction before, which, after what has been said there, I can scarce persuade myself a Man of Mr. *Cooke's* Candour will call in question ; then he can have no farther Objection to his Lordship's Interpretation, that the Word of Prophecy is a *more sure Evidence* of Christ's

Christ's future Coming than what passed in the Holy Mount; but must allow, *that it is more sure*, not only in a loose Sense of the Word, but in the strictest, and *in his own* Sense of it. And thus, my Lord, are his Lordship's own Words at the End of his Discussion of the more sure Word of Prophecy, elucidated and defended *, " That the Prophecy here intended, is probably itself a Gospel Evidence, and so far from being superior to all the Miracles of Christ, and his Apostles, that it owes all its Authority to them." 'Tis enough for a first-rate Genius to throw out a Truth in general, or in a Hint, and leave it to those that follow to enter into the Particulars, to grope about in the Dark, or eclaircise, as they can : If I can do the latter, 'tis Honour enough for me.

One Word more of Criticism, and then, my Lord, I have done with λόγος βεβαιότερον. Our Translation makes βεβαιότερον to be the Accusative, and to agree with λόγον : But what if we should make βεβαιότερον the Neuter Gender, and, commanding after it, should place τ. λ. in Appo-

* Page 23.

sition to it, thus—*ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον, ἢ
προφητικὸν λόγον*, we have also “what is
more sure, *the Word of Prophecy*. ’Tis
certain that this gives *Clearness and Force*
to the Expression, which seems to be want-
ing when *βεβαιότερον* is involved as an Ad-
jective with *λόγον*; the *Order of Con-
struction* is the most obvious; and the *Lon-
guage* will admit of it, for as *τις* is often
redundant, so is it sometimes understood*.
But if, because it *has* been considered as
an Adjective to *λόγον*, it *must* still be so, I
am content. However, there is one Altera-
tion in the Translation necessary to the *λόγον
προφητικόν* in this Sense, and which is suffi-
ciently expressed in the Original by the *Ar-
ticle*, tho’ unattended to in the Translation;
We have also *the* more sure Word of Pro-
phesy.

It follows, “*To which (ᾧ) ye do well to
attend;*” or, “*To which attending ye do
“well, as unto a Light shining in a dark
“Place, until the Day dawn, and the Day-
“star arise in your Hearts.*” This dark
Place is dark enough indeed, and seems
to be made more so by the Pains that have

* Steph. Thef. in voce.

been taken to *enlighten* it. 'Tis possible, that the Context before and after may throw more Light upon it, than Criticism on the Word *αὐχμηρός*; at least, if there are *different* Senses, enough to direct us to the *true* one.

The *ἔ* here may relate either to the *προφητικὸν λόγον* only, that is, to *the Word of Prophecy* in general, as in the ancient Prophets, as well as in *St. Peter*; or to the whole Sentence, *We have also the more sure Word of Prophecy*, in which Case it refers only to the Word of Prophecy in *St. Peter*, What this Sentence is connected to *after* it, will eclaircise the Connexion of this Relative with the Sentence *before* it. Besides the *Word of Prophecy*, to which they were to attend, as being a surer Evidence of the Coming of Christ, there follows at the End of the Sentence *another* Reason for their attending to the same Word, "That no Prophecy of Scripture is of private Interpretation or Solution, *ἐπιλύσεως*;" or, more literally, "every Prophecy of Scripture is not of private Interpretation *."

This

* *Camperarius* considers the prophetic Impulse to be here understood as *revealing* and not *interpreting* the Revelations of

This therefore can belong to no Word of Prophecy, but *such by which the Prophecies*

of others. Dr. Hammond, taking it in the same Sense with him, conceives ἐπίλυσις to be an *agonistic* Term, used "to signify the Starting, or Watchword, or Sign," upon giving of which the Racers started; and that it is thence transferred to the Mission of the Prophets. The sole Foundation of all this is, that the *Careers*, or Starting places, are in *Greek* called ἀγῶνισμα, "Where, when they set out, they" are said to be *let loose*, and this is literally ἐπιλύεσθαι. This learned Man's Meaning here is, that this may literally be called so; for it cannot be said that it *ever is*: He does not pretend any Authority for it. And indeed no Instance, I believe, can be brought of ἐπίλυσις, I will not say in any Sense of *agonistic* Exercise, but in any Sense at all of *Mission*. Suidas, indeed, has ἐπίλυσις, ἐρως, and Φαεωρινί from him; but ἐπίλυσις there, as was observed by *Portus* before Dr. Hammond, and has been since by *Kaſter*, is a plain Mistake of Suidas's own, for ἐπιδόσις, or ἐπύλυσις, Words of a different *Origin*, and a quite different Sense too from the *Agonistic*. Nor can it be pretended, that ἐπίλυσις is ever once used in the Sacred Writers for the prophetic Impulse or Mission; the Places from the Prophets cited by him having all εἰς ἑλᾶα, and not, as one would imagine from his manner of Expression, ἐπύλυσιν. I must farther add, that where-ever the Word ἐπίλυσις is used by the Sacred Writers (for 'tis but seldom (a) that it is), it has the Sense of interpreting, explaining, or resolving a Thing dark or doubtful: And indeed not only the Use of the Word, but the Sense of it here, for *authentically interpreting*

(a) Gen. xli. 13. Mar. iv. 34. Act. xix. 39.

of Scripture were interpreted, which could not be the Word of Prophecy of the *Law*, but of the *Gospel*, that by which the Prophecies of the Scripture had been *authentically* interpreted by those who preached the

the old Prophecies, has been shewn so consonant to what the Apostle has said in his First Epistle, and to the Force of the prophetic Term ἀγγέλλειν there used, as is abundantly sufficient to shew, that *Camerarius's* Application of ἐπίλυσις to *Revelation*, and not *Interpretation*, is as much without Foundation, as *Dr. Hammond's* *Agonistic* Sense of it is. And indeed, so inconsistent did *Heinsius* and *Grotius* think the Term ἐπίλυσις with *Camerarius's* Sense, that, in order to make Way for it, which they, not seeing the Force of πρὸς τῆς ἀγγέλλειν, adopted, they were for changing the Word into another of a different Origin, which might admit of it; *Grotius* following others in substituting ἐπύλυσιν, and *Heinsius* proposing ἐπίλδοις, from ἐπιρχομαι; but this without the Authority of one various Reading to countenance it: A Liberty to be taken with no Author, unless in a Case of the most evident Necessity, and in the Sacred Writings, quite subversive of the Authority of the Text. If therefore the Sense of Impulse or Mission is to be given to the Word, it is to be sought in the Sense of ἐπίλυσις from λύω, and not in ἐπύλυσι, or ἐπίλδοις, from ἐπιρχομαι; and with what Success *Dr. Hammond* has done this, in affixing to it an *Agonistic* Sense, has been shewn. To confirm what is here said in Defence of ἐπίλυσις, and the Sense of *Interpretation* given it by our Translators, it may not be improper to add, that a cotemporary Jewish Author, *Philo Judæus*, uses the same Word in the same Sense, in his *Vita Contem.*

Gospel

Gospel in the Holy Spirit: And as St. Peter had before mentioned only the Word of Prophecy which *he had*, the *ω* to which they did well to attend, was that Word especially; that Word was particularly meant, as being the same which the *Prophets of Scripture* had. And indeed the very Term προφητείας γραφῆς, the Prophecies of Scripture, seems to be put in Contradistinction to those orally delivered by the same Spirit. What follows, is expressed in such a manner as reminds them of the Authority of *both*, and that no Attention was to be paid to *any Interpretation which did not proceed from the same Spirit*, and had not the same Vouchers to warrant it. An Observation of how much Weight, and how fitly introduced, to close the Impression he intended, after he was dead, to leave of his *own Authority*, who had taught them the Doctrine, against that of those *false Teachers*, who had none of those distinguish'd Favours he had been honoured with, nor that *Word of Prophecy which he had*! For Prophecy has not at any time (ποτε) been brought on (ἠνέχθη) by the Will of Man:

It

It did not depend on his own Pleasure to prophesy, but holy Men of God have spoke, impell'd by the Holy Spirit; ὑπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν. As it was the Holy Spirit which spake in them * it must be the same Spirit which must interpret what it had designedly left dark and unreveal'd.

The Reference of *that* which they did well to attend to, *the Word of Prophecy* which St. Peter had, and by which he had made known the Doctrine to them, being thus settled; we may, with better Success, proceed to the intermediate Sentence: For that, which they were to attend to, was, *the Light shining in a dark Place*; they were to attend to it, ὡς λύχνῳ φαίνοντι ὃν ἀνέχμησεν τὸ πῶς, till the Day dawn, and the Day-star arise in their Hearts. Now, if the *Word of Prophecy* which the Apostle had, was the *Light shining*; the *dark Place* must be the *Prophecies of the Old Testament*, to which the Holy Spirit had given Light, by St. Peter's inspir'd Interpretation and Explanation of them: But still this enlightening was but

* Ἐρμηνεύς ἔστιν ὁ προφήτης ἐνδοθεν ὑποχρῶν τὰ λεγόμενα θεῶ. Philo Jud. de Præm. Such was the general Notion of Prophecy, among the Jews, in St. Peter's Time.

like

like that of a Candle, for so *λῦχνος* generally signifies, in a dark Place; not as that of open Day-light: It gave Light sufficient for the necessary Purposes which requir'd it, but not that full extensive View which the *Day-light* of Prophecy, the *Completion* of it, would bring with it. Nothing remains but to shew, that this was the real Fact; that Light sufficient to the present Purposes of his Christians was given the old Prophecies by St. Peter's inspir'd Interpretation, but not that full Light, in which they would be seen at the Completion. Now the Prophecies relating to *the everlasting Kingdom* were a Place of Darkness before; neither the Prophets who deliver'd them, nor those to whom they were deliver'd, understood them; they had now *as much Light* bestow'd on them as was necessary for the Faith and Hopes of Christians. They had seen the suffering Messiah of the Prophets verify'd in *Jesus*; they had indisputable Evidence of his being rais'd to a glorify'd State; had been by Christian Prophecy taught, that *He* was the Messiah of the old Prophets, of whose * *Sufferings, and the Glory that should*

* 1 Ep. i. 11.

follow,

follow, they had testify'd beforehand; and that it was from Him they were to expect † an Inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserv'd in Heaven for them; the || everlasting Kingdom prophesy'd of by them: They had been assur'd, by the same Spirit of Christian Prophecy, that the *last time* the ἰσχυλὸς καιρὸς, or ἰσχυροῦ χρόνου, or ἰσχυραὶ ἡμέραι, the Time of the *last Dispensation of Religion*, that under the Messiah, was come; and that under this * they were to expect that Epoch of his Kingdom, that *Coming of his*, on whose Appearance they should receive the *Crown of Glory that fadeth not away*, 1 Pet. iv. 5. They knew that

† Ib. Ver. 4. || 2 Ep. i. 11.

* St. Peter, in the same Chapter, tells us, not only that the last Times were come, but that it was in that Time they were to expect Salvation. "Christ, says he, who was fore-ordained before the Beginning of the World, was manifested ἐν ἰσχυραῖς τῷ χρόνῳ (1 Ep. i. 20.) in the Age preceding the End of it (as he was fore-ordained before the Beginning of it), or in the Age of the Messiah; which, as it was evidently then begun when the Apostle wrote, is, by our Translators, expressively rendered *these last Times*. Now it was in the same age, ἐν καιρῷ ἰσχυρῷ, that the Inheritance which fadeth not away, reserv'd in Heaven (Ver. 4.), the faithful Christian's Salvation, was ready to be revealed (Ver. 5.): ἐτοιμὴ ἀποκαλυφθῆναι prepared whenever the Thing should

should happen, as the Word signifies (iii. 15.) ; when they should be found unto Praise, and Honour, and Glory, at the Revelation ἀποκαλύψει of Jesus Christ (Ver. 7.) ; when they should receive the End of their Faith, the Salvation of their Souls (Ver. 9.) the Salvation of which the Prophets, who prophesied of Christ, had inquired and searched diligently (Ver. 10, &c.) 'Tis the same last Age of the Gospel-Dispensation which he understands, when he says, ελευθερίας ἔσχατης. (or, as several MSS. of good Authority, have it, ἔσχατων ἡμερῶν) ἐμπαύσεται, there shall come in the last Days Scoffers, &c. (iii. 3.) which St. Jude, in synonymous Terms, expresses by ἐσχατῶ χρόνῳ ἰσθῆαι ἐμπαύσεται (Ver. 18.). In the same manner St. Peter says, that the Completion of the Prophecies at the Effusion of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, was ἐν ταῖς ἔσχαταις ἡμέραις in the last Days. Thus likewise, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, God speaks unto us in these last Days, ἐν ἔσχατων τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων (i. 1.), by his Son. St. John employs a similar Expression, for what was plainly likewise then present, ἐσχατὴ ὥρα ἐστίν (1 Ep. ii. 18.) ; and thus universally throughout the New Testament, ἔσχατος, or ἔσχατος, joined with ἡμέραι, καιροί or καιροί, χρόνος or χρόνος, ὥρα, signifies the last Age of the World, that of the Gospel-Dispensation, which was to end with τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἔσχατῃ, the last Day, or Day of Judgment, or Coming of Christ ; when that which was the proper Kingdom of Christ was to cease, and the End, τὸ τέλος, cometh, when he shall deliver up the Kingdom to God, even the Father. These Expressions are borrowed from the Septuagint, where the ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις are applied to express the Time of the Coming and Kingdom of the Messiah, and such Events as shall happen in it. The (a) Prophecy of Jacob, in which the Coming of Shiloh is foretold ; Balaam's Star out of Jacob, and Sceptre out of Israel (b), are introduced with what

(a) Gen. iv. 9.

(b) Num. xxix. 14.

shall

that in this everlasting Kingdom they should

shall happen, ἐν ἰσχυράταις ἡμέραις. 'Tis in the *last Days* that the Messiah's Kingdom, described in (c) *Isaiah* and (d) *Micah*, shall come to pass; in the *last Days* that the God of Heaven should set up a Kingdom which should never be destroyed (e). When "the Jews, being scattered among the Nations, and left few in Number among the Heathen, and their turning again to the Lord," is foretold by *Moses* (f); their "abiding many Days without a King, and without a Prince, and without a Sacrifice; and their returning and seeking the Lord their God (g);" is predicted by *Hosea*: It is to be ἐν ἰσχυράταις τῶν ἡμερῶν. On the same Account as the Dispensation of *Christ* was the *last* Dispensation, and the Completion of the two preceding ones; it is that *Christ* is said, in the Epistle to the *Hebrews* (h), to have suffered, in the Time of the Completion of the Ages or End of the World, ἐν συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων; and in that to the *Corinthians* (i), that upon Christians the Ends of the World are come, τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων κατέβησαν. We are apt, from the very manner of the Expression, the *last Days*, the *last Times*, the *End of the World*, to form a Notion of these Terms, as if they carried with them the Idea of the near Approach of the *last Day* (which is every-where in the New Testament carefully distinguished from the Age by τῇ ἰσχυάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ in the Singular, as συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος for the End of the World, in *St. Matt.* ch. xxiv. is from the τέλος and συντέλεια τῶν αἰώνων in the Plural, in the Places above); whereas, in Truth, they have the Name, only from their Reference to the Ages past; in respect of which, they are called the *last*, or the *End*, or rather the Completion of them, the Dispensation which was to be followed by no other.

(c) *Isa.* xii. 1. (d) *Mic.* iv. 1. (e) *Dan.* ii. 28. 44.
 (f) *Deut.* iv. (g) *Hos.* v. (h) ix. 26. (i) 1 Ep.
 2. 11.

be * “Partakers of the Divine Nature.” Thus they had “exceeding great and precious Promises” to rely on, tho’ it was not reveal’d to them in what this partaking of the Divine Nature consisted; nor could they have any just Conception of it till they came to experience it; till this *φωσφόρος*, or *φωδότης*, the only possible Bringer or Giver of Light in this Respect, the Day-star, should arise in their Hearts or Minds: They knew, too, that ’twas in the *present Time*, under the *present Dispensation*, that they were to be put in Possession of these Promises; but when, under this Dispensation, was the Time of this Coming, was not within the Revelation of *Christian Prophecy*, any more than of the *Jewish*; that lay still hid in the Counsels of God †, and only some Marks

* 2 Ep. i. 4.

† When the Apostles, at the Time of *Christ’s* Ascension to his Glory, as Son of God, in a Body address’d him with “Lord, wilt thou at this Time restore again the Kingdom to *Israel*?” he plainly told them, that to know the *Time* of this was no Part of their Commission, which consisted in their being his Witnesses, and for which they should receive the necessary Powers on the Descent of the Holy Ghost. “It is not for you to know the Times, and the Seasons, which the Father

and Characters were given, by which it might, on its near Approach, be known. Thus did Christian Prophecy, under the last Dispensation, enlighten Prophecy under the former. It was before a *dark Place*, and Light was now given it; which, however, tho' but like that of a Candle, compar'd to the full Day-light, was sufficient till Day, the Day of Prophecy, should dawn forth, and bring with it the Revelation or Manifestation of it in the Completion; the Event itself being the proper Light, the Day-light, and Prophecy, that substituted Light, the only one which an Event, before 'tis actually come, will admit of: Then would they see the whole Scheme of Prophecy, which had been gradually open'd, in a full meridian Light; whatever they before could not, they

"Father hath put in his own Power" (*Act. i. 7.*); so put in his own Power, that "of that Day, and that Hour, knew no Man; no, not the Angels which are in Heaven; neither the Son, but the Father" (*Mark xiii. 35.*): And therefore it was to be expected as a Thief in the Night (*Matt. xxiv. 43.*). Doctrines of his Lord, these, which St. Peter had not forgot, when he reminds his Christians of the Gospel-Doctrine (*1 Thess. v. 4. Rev. xvi. 15.*); that *the Day of the Lord would come as a Thief in the Night* (*2 Ep. iii. 10.*).

would then see, in all its Import; but for this they must wait till *that Day of the Lord* should dawn, or *shine out around them*; for διαυγάζειν, here us'd, has both Senses*.

I flatter myself, my Lord, you will allow, that this Explanation has Day-light diffus'd thro' it. To my Eyes, which are none of

* Some Interpreters, and, among the rest, the late Dr. Middleton, as exact in his Reasoning and Interpretation, as faithful in his Citation and Translation, and who has, I hear, in his posthumous Piece, flung away that Mask it was of no Use any longer to wear, have understood these Words not to relate to the Manifestation of these Things at the *Completion*, but to some *future Illumination* they were to receive from the Holy Spirit; when, according to their Progress in the Faith, they should have a clearer and more perfect Knowledge of *Christ*, and the divine Mysteries; or, according to some, when they should obtain the *Gift of Prophecy themselves*. Now both these Interpretations, not to insist on the *novitiate* State which the former *falsely* proceeds on, suppose what is not to be supposed; that Christians in general were to expect, in this Life, a clearer Revelation of these Things than they have already; or that they were to be honoured with the Gift of Prophecy; and are both inconsistent with what has been shewn to be the Apostle's peculiar Design in the Passage: For this, instead of establishing a lasting Authority in the Minds of those he writes to, would be, in Effect, to raise in them an Expectation of being equal with him themselves, and destroy the Authority he intended to establish.

the

the best, all appears clear and satisfactory: I should hope, therefore, it does so to you, who have so much better. You'll observe, that the Thing which gives the Light to all, which is the φωσφόρος here, is the Sense of λόγος ὁ προφητικός. If, therefore, this Sense gives a *full Light* to the Context; if it be the *proper* and genuine *Sense* of the Word, and a *full Authority* for it has been produc'd; what more can be done, to shew that this is the real and genuine Sense of the Apostle?

Perhaps the new Sense, which Mr. *Ashton* has given to αὐχμηρός, of *desart* instead of *dark*, and the Suggestion that the τόπος αὐχμηρός is in Allusion to the *Wilderness* thro' which the *Israelites* pass'd to their *Canaan*, may seem a little to obscure the Perspicuity I have mention'd; but he must allow me to call all this but an ingenious *Conjecture*. I have no Authority, but Mr. *Ashton's* own, that αὐχμηρός does ever signify a *Desart*; but I have Authorities greater, in this Case, at least, than his, that it sometimes signifies *dark*. As the Word no-where else occurs in the Sacred Writings, 'tis the Use of the Word, in the Language in general,

that we can only have recourse to. Now we have in *Hesychius* αὐχμηρός, explain'd by οὐλόδης; and in *Suidas* by οὐλόειρος; but where is the Authority of αὐχμηρός for a Desert? I know of none; and Mr. *Ashton* has given us none. I must, therefore, conclude, at least till an Example is brought for the Sense here assum'd, that there is sufficient Authority for the Sense which the Translators have given the Word of *dark*, but none for that which Mr. *Ashton* has given it of a *Desert*, a Land *uninhabited and desert*, as his Words are, and as his Allusion, indeed, requires*.

But,

* "The Word, says this learned Gentleman, which is here translated *dark*, does properly signify dry, by excessive Heat, a barren and dry Land, as the Psalmist expresses it, where no Water is, and which, for that Reason, was uninhabited and desert" (Note, p. 134.). *Hesychius*, indeed, has αὐχμηρός, ξηρός, οὐλόδης; and *Julius Pollux*, among an hundred other Epithets, αὐχμηρός join'd to χερσίω (v. 110.), but with no Determination to any particular Meaning. But supposing it to be the same as ξηρός, and that ξηρός does properly signify dry by excessive Heat; will it, therefore, by Inference, signify also uninhabited and desert? 'Tis not inferenti I, but express Authority, at least express lexicographical Authority, that is expected in such Cases: But here is plainly none. Admit this Sense, however; still 'tis nothing to the Author's Purpose, till it can be shew'd, that χερσίω, in

But, allowing even that *αὐχμηρός* has the Sense of *desart* and uninhabited, as well as

in the Singular, is ever meant of a *Country*; nay, till it can be shewn, too, that *τοῦτο* is. But neither has Mr. *Astou* given us any Authority, but his own, for *αὐχμηρός* properly signifying *dry by excessive Heat*: Nor do I know of any, but that which this Gentleman seems to have made use of, without mentioning it, *Henry Stephens's*, who, in the primitive, has *αὐχμὸς* ad *αἶω*, with two Senses; *Siccitas ex vehementi aestu*—and *Squalor*; but in the Derivative *αὐχμηρός* has only the Sense of *Squalor*. The *Droughts* from *excessive Heat*, therefore, in the Primitive, Mr. *Astou* had no Right to make use of in the Derivative, as his Author had no Authority, nor has given any for it. We have, however, from *Hesychius*, furnished one of *αὐχμηρός*, *dry*, but not *dry from excessive Heat*; and, from the same Authority, we have *αὐχμοὶ ἀρεμῆσιαι*. *αὐχμὸς*, *ξηρασία*, *ἀροχία*, *ἰσθμὸς*, καὶ *μαλῆσιαι* ἀπὸ τῆς *λίμης* ἀπὸ *ἀροχίας* γινώσκουσιν; where we see, *Droughts* from *excessive Heat*, so far from being the proper, that it does not appear to have been the primitive Sense of the Word; and that *Drought* from *want of Rain*, a very different Thing, stands as fair for it as *Drought* from *excessive Heat*. *Αὐχμὸς* is, indeed, itself, but a Derivative from *αἶω*, from whence all the different Senses of the several Words, that come from it, are to be deduced: Now, of five Senses of it, to be found in the *Etymologicum magnum* only, *Stephens*, who had not the Etymologist then before him, but copied from *Badou*, has given only two, *arescis* and *interis*. This Defect he has made abundant Amends for, in *αἶω*, in the Appendix; but has left *αὐχμὸς* in the Imperfection it stands in, in his *Tesaurus*. Another of those Senses is, *λάμπα*; so *shine*; and from *αἶω*, in this Sense, we have *αὐχμηρός*, *dark*, καὶ *ἀσπίδης*, as the Etymologists speak.

dark, is not that to be preferr'd which the Context naturally leads to, and which will give Force and Perspicuity to the Whole, to a Sense which is quite assum'd, without any leading to it from what is about it? The Images round it are all Images of Light; a Candle shining—the Day's dawning or shining out in all its Splendor,—the Day-star; and is *dark* or *desart* more naturally oppos'd to these? In a Desert 'tis a *Guide*, and not a *Light*, that is wanting. But the ingenious Author has found an Expedient for this. 'Tis the Wilderness which the *Israelites* journey'd thro' that is here alluded to, and the Pillar of Fire by the λύχνο; but this is mere Imagination. I will not say, that the comparing the Pillar to a Candle, is stretching the Imagination; because, in the Sacred Writings, λύχνο is sometimes us'd for a Glory: But, in that Case, I should think, that γῆ, or χῶμα, or something equivalent to them, would have been the Term, if *Arabia* had been the Place in View; or, if the Journeying of the *Israelites* thro' it, ὁδός: But τόπος αὐχμηρός is really more suited to a *Dungeon*, than a *Desart*. Besides, if this must allude to the Journeyings of *Israel*

from

from *Egypt* to *Canaan*; as they were usually by Day, it was the Pillar of the Cloud, and not of Fire, to which, as a *Guide*, the Allusion should rather have been made; nay, perhaps, it would puzzle this ingenious Gentleman to shew, that the Pillar of Fire did, in fact, guide them, in their Journeying, more than once; which was thro' that *dry Desert*, the *Red Sea*.

Upon the Whole, my Lord, whether this critical Examination has set the much-perplex'd Passage of *St. Peter* in a clear convincing Light, is not mine to judge, but yours. Every Man, of Reflection, knows how partial we all are to *our own*; and the only Way of guarding against the almost-imperceptible Infatuation is, to examine *our own* with the same Strictness we do *another's*; and this, I am sure, has not been wanting.

One Thing I must here observe, by way of Corollary, that if the Sense of the *Word of Prophecy*, here establish'd, be true; at the same Time that we have been shewing the true Sense of it, we have been shewing the Futility of all Arguments against Christianity, either open or insidious, drawn from a false Sense of these Words, as effectually

as if we had openly and directly wrote
against them.

If this Explication of the whole Passage,
if what is done here, should appear to your
Lordship in the same Light it does to me;
the Question that obviously arises is, How
comes this not to have been done before?
The Answer is as obvious; Because it has
not been consider'd in this *Manner* before.
The Design of that great Prelate, whose
usual *Discernment* led him first to place the
Comparison of the more sure Word of Pro-
phesy, where it has been shew'd, in this Dis-
cussion, that it is truly plac'd; led him no
farther into the Passage than was necessary
to his Design: And *different Interpretations*
since, arising from considering the Passage
in new Lights (which as they are multi-
farious, various must be the Explications
arising from this Way of considering it),
made it necessary to apply the *Criterion of*
Criticism, and try whether the Sense of the
Passage, thro' the Whole, could be ascer-
tain'd, or not. Far be it from me to make
Pretensions to a superior Sagacity, superior
Learning; the only Merit I pretend to is, to
have apply'd the Rules, which Criticism
affords,

affords, justly towards the Disentanglement of this much-perplex'd Passage; and, in *one such Instance*, to *exemplify* what ought to be done in *all*;—in short, to remind your Lordship of what the learned World seems, at present, to want much to be reminded of, especially in Sacred Literature; that 'tis on *establish'd Rules of Criticism*, and not on partial Lights, and vague Harangue, that Interpretation of Scripture ought to proceed.

We seem, at present, to be in a strong Disposition to get rid of the *Trammels of Criticism*, and indulge *Fancy and Conjecture*; a Scheme well suited to Innovation, and of which it has made ample Advantages. What a fruitful Harvest of Novelties, of this Kind, is the intire Rejection of all *Jewish Points* and Vowelling like to produce in the *Hebrew*, when 'tis reduc'd to a mere *Decyphering*, and Fancy has its full Scope! We already owe to it a goodly System of *Philosophy*; and, by the same Invention, I doubt not but the *profound* Author, had he happen'd to take a Turn that Way, could have given us, on the *Authority of the Hebrew Scriptures*, as good a System of *Cookery*, or *Hippiatrics*.

As

As to the Passage we have been discussing, I dare say 'tis no Objection to your Lordship, that you cannot find the Explication, we have given of it, in the *Commentators*. The same sometimes happens in *Theology*, as you have observ'd often does in *Philology*; that *Commentators* explain every thing but what needs explaining: Besides, they are apt to follow the Duct and Run of their Thoughts; have a great deal before 'em, and cannot be suppos'd to enter as far into Criticism, as may be very reasonably expected from Men who take upon them only the Explication of a single Passage. From *these*, all the Exactness of the most regular Criticism may, with the greatest Reason, be requir'd; but if they will neglect its Aid *themselves*, and indulge Conjecture and Hypothesis, it will lend it to others, to detect the Weakness of the Foundation. And indeed, my Lord, if you imagine, that the Design of all this minute Discussion is something more than appears at first Sight, the settling the disputed Meaning of a single Passage of Scripture; if you begin to suspect it intended as a *Specimen of the Use of neglected Criticism*, towards, at once, evincing the Insufficiency of all Interpretations

pretations of Scripture, which do not proceed on its Principles, and elucidating and ascertaining the Meaning of any difficult Place; you are possibly not far from the Truth. In this Case, however the Design may be executed, you must allow, the Subjects are well chose: Two more *ingenious* Men for the one, and a more *perplex'd* Passage for the other, and which, besides, has the Charms of *dear Novelty* to engage the Attention of such who have any Attention this Way, will not every Day be found.

Your Lordship will, I am sure, allow me *one* Observation more, when I tell you 'tis the *last*: That, if my Explication of this Passage is not clear and satisfactory to you, the Fault, probably, lies in *me*, and not in the *Method*. If the Place *can* be ascertain'd; the *general* Design of the Writer, the *particular* Design of the Passage,—the settling the Meaning of Terms, from the *Author himself*, if it can be; if it be a Term of *Science* or *Institution*, from the *Writers on the Science or Institution*; from such Writers as the Author is *most conversant in*, and *imitates*; from the *Use* of the Language in *general*;—if the Terms admit of *various Senses*, and the

Sen-

Sentences of various *Construction*, the preferring that which is most agreeable to the particular and general *Design* before mention'd, and to the *Writer's own Doctrine*, and that of his *Profession and Set*.—and if there be various Readings, and a Necessity of Emendation, the observing the same Rules, together with those of *literal Criticism*—these are certainly the regular and orderly Steps, not only in *sacred*, but in any *Criticism*: And, besides Inquiry concerning the Genuineness of the Piece, where that is doubted (a Thing which has no Place here, as the Genuineness of the Epistle is by all Parties of this Dispute suppos'd), seem to be *All that can* be done towards *ascertaining* the Sense of a disputed Passage. The Way, you see, my Lord, is long, long in Comparison of the very *short one of Hypothesis*; but long as it is, 'tis the only *true one*. If the Sense of any Passage *can* be fix'd, 'tis in this Manner it *must* be fix'd.

I am far from insinuating, that if this is not done here, it cannot be done: More *Learning*, greater *Sagacity*, a better *Acquaintance with scriptural Terms*, may elucidate that which I have not been able to

do: What I contend for, only, is, that 'tis by the Use of *these Means* that it must be done, if it can. And I need not mention, to your Lordship, how agreeable it would be to me, where-ever I am wrong, to be set right. To a Man who has no View but *Truth, Truth*, come from whom it will, is always well receiv'd.

I have nothing more, my Lord, but to ask your Pardon for this *long* Trouble; and, with great Sincerity, subscribe myself

Your Lordship's most oblig'd,

Nov. 19.

1750.

obedient humble Servant.



A P.



APPENDIX

TO the numerous Instances of a higher Degree of Communication from God to Prophets, after *Moses*, than those of the Vision and the Dream, given p. 94, &c. and p. 122, &c. of this *Essay*; I know of nothing that can be oppos'd, but the Doctrine of the later *Jews*, with regard to the *Gradus Mosaiscus* of Prophecy; and the seeming Inconsistence of the Passage in *Numbers* xii. where God, on occasion of *Aaron* and *Miriam*'s pretending to an equal Degree of Authority with their Brother, because they were honour'd with equal Communications from the Deity; *Hath the Lord indeed spoken only by Moses? Hath he not spoken also by us?* formally declares the Difference between him and other Prophets. It must be allow'd, that the rabbinical Doctrine of Prophecy is irreconcilable

cileable with what is here advanc'd on the *Word of Prophecy*, since it places one Part of the *Gradus Mosaicus* not only in what it might truly, perhaps, have been placed, that *Moses* had no Revelation by Vision or Dream; but denies that any Prophet, after him, had any * other. But the Passage in *Numbers* xii. may, I conceive, be very well reconcil'd with the other Passages of the Sacred Writings, there produc'd; and, if it *may*, it cannot be deny'd but that it *ought*. It is in these Terms: "Hear now my Words: If there be a Prophet among you, I the Lord will make myself known unto him in a Vision, and will speak unto him in a Dream. My Servant *Moses* is not so, who is faithful in all mine House. With him will I speak Mouth to Mouth, even apparently, and not in dark Speeches; and the Similitude of the Lord shall he behold: Wherefore then were ye not afraid to speak against my Servant *Moses*?" Ver. 6—8.

* *Maimonides Sanhed. c. xi. 1. & apud Smith. Select Disc. p. 261.* In the latter Place this makes the first, in the former the second Part of this prophetic Difference.

To reconcile this to the Instances of a higher Degree of Prophecy than the Vision, and the Dream, vouchsafed to many afterwards under that Dispensation; 'tis plain that these Words must either be restrain'd to the Time of *Moses*, or that Vision here is not to be taken in the common Sense in which we use it in *English*, of Vision properly so call'd, which, indeed, is the same as the rabbinical Sense.

If we confine the Words to the Age of *Moses*, 'tis certain, that this will fully answer to the Intention of the Case; which was, to repress that Rising of the Mind of those who were call'd upon to hear, against the Authority of *Moses*, on pretence of equal Communications from the Lord with him: But then the same Difficulty will recur upon us, that, in several Places, God reveal'd himself to *Aaron* in the same Species of Revelation as to *Moses*, by the Word. Thus we have, in the same Chapter*, *The Lord spake unto Aaron*, and *the Lord spake unto Moses*; and these distinct and separate Revelations: And frequently the Revelation is made to both, jointly, by the same Word; and † "the

* Num. xviii.

† Ib. xix. xx. & passim.

" Lord

"Lord spake unto Moses, and unto Aaron, saying." And in the Case to which these Words belong, * "The Lord spake suddenly unto Moses, and unto Aaron, and unto Miriam; Come out, ye Three, unto the Tabernacle of the Congregation." They were in the Camp, when the Word came unto them. Neither can this be evaded by supposing, that in such Places, where God is said to speak unto *Aaron*, no more is meant than in those where the Expression is, "The Lord spake unto *Moses*," saying, Speak unto *Aaron*:" For it is to be remember'd, that † "The Lord said to *Aaron*, Go into the Wilderness to meet *Moses*;" when *Aaron* was in *Egypt*, and *Moses* in the Wilderness; and, consequently, the Communication was immediately to *Aaron*, and not by *Moses*. It remains, therefore, to inquire, Whether *the Vision* has not sometimes a Sense so lax, as to take *the Word* into it.

The original Words, employ'd for this Purpose, are generally Derivatives of *Hazah* and *Raab*, which both signify to see, and to foresee: They may, therefore, in

* Num. xii. 4.

† Exod. iv. 27.

their Nature, be apply'd to Prophecy in general; to *the Word*, as well as to *Vision* in its proper Sense. And that the former are so apply'd, has been observ'd by *Hebraeans*, and with good Reason: For, besides the proper *Vision*, for which it is us'd in several Places of *Daniel*, we find *Hazon* for Revelation, by *the Word* in particular, and for Revelation in general. Thus we have the Vision (*Hazon*) which *Isaiab* saw * (*bazab*), tho' there was no proper *Vision* in the Case; the Word which *Isaiab* saw (*bazab*) †: And so there was no open Vision (*bazon*), i.e. Revelation, when the *Word of the Lord* came to *Samuel* ‖. The same might have been observ'd of the Derivatives of *Raab*. The Word us'd in this Passage, "I will make myself known unto him in a Vision," is *Marab*; which, when it is, in several Places of *Ezekiel* and *Daniel*, put for the proper *Vision*, is, in the same Chapter in *Samuel* ‡, us'd for the very same Thing as *bazon* had been before; "he fear'd to shew *Eli* the Vision." In the same Manner the *Greek* Translators have ὄραμα and

* Isa. i. 1.

† Ib. ii. 1.

‖ 1 Sam. iii. 1.

‡ Ver. 15.

sometimes, for *the proper Vision*, sometimes for *the Word*. Thus the Word, which *Moses* here makes use of, will signify a *Revelation*, and include under it both the *Word* and the *proper Vision*, the Species of Prophecy distinct from the Dream; and, taking it in that Sense, what is there said is intirely consistent with what appear'd to be the Fact afterwards, and then, too, in the *Jewish Church*.

What, then, do those other Words, in which *Moses* is distinguish'd from all other Prophets, mean? "With him will I speak *Mouth to Mouth*, even apparently," or by *Vision*; which Word, in the Original, is the same as before, but here means not *prophetic*, but *real Vision*. For if it was to be taken in the same Sense here as before, one would, in whatsoever Sense you take that Word, be a flat Contradiction to the other. Very like these are the Words in the additional Chapter to *Deuteronomy**: "There arose not a Prophet like unto *Moses*, whom the Lord knew, or who knew the Lord (for the Words will ad-

* Deut. xxxix. 10.

" mit of both Constructions) Face to Face." And both seem to respect that in *Exodus**,
 " And the Lord spake unto *Moses*, Face to
 " Face, as a Man speaketh unto his Friend." This was upon *Moses's* first coming down from the Mount with the Tables, when, in the Sight of all *Israel*, " as he enter'd into
 " the Tabernacle, the cloudy Pillar descended†, and stood at the Door of the
 " Tabernacle, and the Lord talk'd with
 " *Moses*." The Place in the Tabernacle, of this intimate Communication, was within the Veil, in the Holy of Holies, where, says the Lord (Ch. xxv. 22.) " I will meet
 " with thee, and will commune with thee
 " from above the Mercy-seat, from between
 " the two Cherubims, which are upon the
 " Ark of the Testimony, of all Things
 " which I shall give thee in Commandment
 " unto the Children of *Israel*." Here it was, within the Tabernacle of *Testimony*, or Witness, that God then talk'd with *Moses*, while *Joshua*, his Servant, was in the outer Part of the Tabernacle without the Veil, in the Tabernacle of the *Congregation* (Chap. xxxiii. 7. 11.). Hither *Moses* resorted, oc-

* *Exod.* xxxiii. 11.† *Ib.* xxxiii. 9.

asionally,

caſionally, whenever it was neceſſary (*Num.* vii. 8, 9, &c. 17.) “to ſpeak with him;” and then he heard the Voice of one “ſpeaking unto him from off the Mercy-ſeat that was upon the Ark of Teſtimony” from between the Cherubims (*Num.* vii. “89.”) This now was, incontestably, *Revelation by the Word of God*, *Revelation by the ſame Medium*, and, conſequently, of the ſame Species, as was diſpens’d in the ſeveral Inſtances before ſpecify’d, but in a very *different Manner*, under ſuch diſtinguiſh’d Circumſtances of Favour, as no one Prophet, thro’ all thoſe Inſtances of *Revelation by the Word*, was honour’d with; a Communication ſo near and intimate, that it would be difficult to find any Terms more expreſſive of it, than thoſe of the Lord’s *ſpeaking with him Mouth to Mouth, even by Viſion* of the *Shechinah* between the Cherubims, *Face to Face, as a Man ſpeaketh unto his Friend*: And thus, in full Propriety, may it be ſaid, with reſpect to this *Manner of Revelation by the Word*, peculiar to *Moses*, that there did not ariſe in *Iſrael* a Prophet like unto him; whom the Lord knew, or who knew the Lord, *Face to Face*. I cannot but add,

as 'tis an Observation which shews how peculiarly the understanding the Words, *speaking to Moses Mouth to Mouth*, of speaking to him from the Mercy-seat, is adapted to confound *Aaron's* Pretensions to an equal Degree of Favour with God; and, consequently, is greatly corroborative of this Sense: That as "he is *faithful* in all mine House," reminded *Aaron* of his own Defection at that Time; so did these Words put him in mind of the superior Rank *Moses* had in God's Favour, he having, at any time, an Access to the Holy of Holies, to which *Aaron* was admitted but once a Year, and that not to talk with God, as a Man unto his Friend; but, with Humiliation, to make Atonement for his own Sins, and the Sins of the People. However, tho' God often spake to *Moses* thus, Mouth to Mouth, even by Vision from between the Cherubims, in such a Manner as he never did to any other Prophet; yet it was not always that the Lord *thus spake* unto him: For, in the present Case, "the Lord spake suddenly unto *Moses*, and unto *Aaron*, and unto *Miriam*;" and thus the Lord often spake to *Moses*, and to *Aaron*, together; And, probably,

probably, 'tis the Word of the Lord in the *common manner* of the Word coming to the Prophets, that is meant, when no more is said than *the Lord spake unto Moses*. Upon the Whole, it should seem, as if it was only sometimes, when it was necessary to impress Authority on the Minds of the People, and the Cloud visibly descending, as in the xxiiid of *Exodus*, gave a sensible Demonstration to all, that *God spake to him*; or when it was necessary to consult God on any Occasion, and the Word of the Lord did not come to him in the usual manner; that this distinguished *Manner* of Communication in that *Species* of Revelation, by the Word, was used: And that at other times the Lord spake unto *Moses*, in the same manner he did to other Prophets, whom he honoured with his Word; to *Aaron* then, to *Joshua*, *Samuel*, *Elijah*, *Elisha*, &c. afterwards.

It follows, "*and not in dark Speeches*," which I consider, not as respecting the Vision and the Dream before-mentioned, but the "speaking to him, as a Man speaketh unto his Friend," without Reserve, declaring unto him plainly his whole Intention; a
Favour,

Favour, which, we see by St. Peter, was not granted to all those, who were yet honoured with *the Word*; but was highly becoming a Revelation, which was not so much of future Events, as of a present Law, and Rule of Action, which in its Nature requires, that it should be plain and understood by him, thro' whose Ministry it was to be delivered;

And the Similitude of the Lord shall be beheld; The Translators of the *Pentateuch*, the oldest and best of the *Greek* Translators, and the *Syriac*, here have "And the Glory of the Lord *has* he seen;" plainly referring to that Exhibition in the Mount, which, at *Moses's* humble Request, "I beseech thee, shew me thy Glory," in the same xxxiii^d Chapter of *Exodus*, the Lord was pleased to honour him with, and in a very different manner from the Visions of *Isaiab* and *Ezekiel*. 'Tis very certain, that this Exhibition of Glory in the Mount, is quite different from the *Shechinah* of the Mercy-seat, and which *Aaron* and *Miriam* had been no more admitted to, than they had to the speaking Face to Face at the Tabernacle. Both therefore, distinctly urg'd,
were

were very fit to confound Pretensions to equal Authority with *Moses*, drawn from such Suggestions as "Hath the Lord *only* spoken by *Moses*? Hath he not *also* spoken by us?" And therefore, because it was fit, in order to the End in View, I cannot forbear giving the Preference to that Sense of the Words, which supposes it to be done, before the other, which does not. God seems to urge upon them three distinct Reasons—"Moses is faithful in all mine House," which *Aaron* could not but be conscious that he had not been—His "*speaking Mouth to Mouth to him, as a Friend,*" from between the Cherubims—and his having honoured him with *seeing his Glory* in the Mount; each of them plainly evincing *Moses's* Superiority to them, and the higher Degree of Favour he had with the Lord, and all together strongly inculcating the Inference drawn from them, "Wherefore then were ye not afraid to speak against my Servant *Moses*?"

If then the Passage in *Numbers* xii. be perfectly reconcilable with what has been advanced in this Essay, concerning Revelation by *the Word* as the highest Species of
Pro-

Prophecy, *distinct* from those of Vision and Dream, under the Law, and communicated to many of the Prophets under that Dispensation: If the speaking to God Face to Face, or Mouth to Mouth, infer not a different *Species* of Prophecy from that of the *Word*, but a different *Manner* of Communication in that Species, from the Mercy-seat, and peculiar to *Moses*: And if the knowing God Face to Face in the last Chap. of *Deuteronomy* may respect the same *Manner*; the Rabbinical Doctrine, that no Prophet after *Moses* had any higher Degree of Prophecy than Vision or Dream, can receive no Support from either of these Passages; but it rests solely on *Rabbinical Authority*. Now whatever that may be in the proper Subjects of it, in Subjects of Civil or Ecclesiastical Custom, yet *this* is quite without the Limits of it, and a modern Christian is as fit a Judge of it, as an antient *Jew*; the Medium of Judging to both being the Scriptures of the Old Testament, and these only. Now to this Authority standing thus unsupported, may be opposed every Instance before given from their own Scriptures, of the *Word of God*, a Species of Prophecy distinct from

from the Vision and the Dream, and not attended with the ecstatic Disorders of them, vouchsafed to other Prophets besides *Moses*, tho' not under the same Circumstances of Favour as to *Moses*. This Freedom from the ecstatic Confusion with which the lower Orders of Prophecy were attended, is likewise by the *Gradus Mosaicus* made peculiar to *Moses*; but there are no more Vestiges of any such Disorder in the Cases of Revelation by the Word specified in this Essay, than there is in the Case of *Moses*. Whence then the Foundation for *this* Distinction of the *Gradus Mosaicus*, another of the four Parts of it? In good Truth, only from Rabbinical Reverie. And the Inconsistence of that Part, of *Moses's* Propheying without the Mediation of any Angelical Power, with what ^a *St. Stephen* and ^b *St. Paul* have said, has been observed ^c long ago. So that the remaining Part, "the Liberty of *Moses* to prophesy at all times," appears to be the only one which has any real Foundation. Indeed the Notion itself seems to have been of no great Antiquity in the *Jewish Church*, not known in the Age of the Apostles, nor

^a Acts vii.^b Gal. iii.^c Smith, p. 262.

when

when the *Mishnah* was composed, nor in the Time of *Eusebius*, or at least to him; tho' it is now become an Article of Faith with the *Jews* (as their Catechism so often reprinted at *Amsterdam* shews), as well as the divine Authority of their recondite oral Law transmitted down to them from *Moses* himself. Out of this instituting a higher Degree of Prophecy for *Moses*, and the received Division of their Scriptures into the three *Parts*, the Law, the Prophets, and the *Hagiographa*; their third Species of Inspiration corresponding to that Division, seems to have been formed by the later *Jews*, and their Distinction of the *Ruach Hakadosh* from Prophecy to have risen; a Distinction which has this Absurdity in it, that tho' it is made the lowest Degree of Divine Inspiration, yet it has one of the Peculiar of the highest, Freedom from that Perturbation with which the intermediate Degree was in its Nature attended^d. It was only among the later Rabbi's that the Holy Spirit was distinguished off from Prophecy; the elder ascribed the Prophecies of an *Isaiah* and *Ezekiel* to the Spirit^e.

^d *Main*, ap. *Smith*, c. vii.

^e *Smith*, c. vii. p. 233.

What is more to the Purpose than an Inconsistence of Rabbinical Doctrine with this *Word of the Lord* as a Revelation superior to *Vision* and *Dream*, and common to many Prophets as well as *Moses*, is the Appearance it may have of lessening the Evidence of the Prophecy of God's *raising up a Prophet* like unto *Moses*, as relative to Christ. The Jewish Doctors generally understand the Prophecy of *Joshua*; but Christians refer it to Christ, as St. Peter and St. Stephen have both expressly done, being however divided in the manner of doing it. Some make it a double Prophecy, and to respect not only Christ, but also the Succession of Prophets, whose Ministry God, in the Course of the Theocracy, made use of to signify his Will to his People concerning present, to apprise them of future Events, to exhort, dehort, &c. Others refer it to Christ only. Whether it be Christ *only*, or a Succession of Prophets *as well as* Christ, that is there intended, does not seem a Matter of very great Moment: The Business is to evince, that the Prophecy is predictive of another Dispensation of Religion, or a *new Cove-*

* Deut. xviii.

† Acts iii. 22. vi. 37.

nant, and a *new Mediator* or Minister of that Covenant, and not of *occasional Prophecy*; which my Lord of *London* has fully done. After having observed, that the Occasion of the Promise was the Request of the People at the *Giving of the Law*, that *Moses* might speak to them, and not God, lest they should die, his Lordship proceeds, s “ To apply
 “ this Promise to any thing else besides the
 “ Giving of a Law, is making it to have
 “ no Relation to the Request upon which it
 “ was granted.—The Request related
 “ merely to the manner of God’s giving his
 “ Law : They were under no Uneasiness at
 “ his Method of conveying Prophecies to
 “ them : And consequently the Promise of
 “ God must relate to the Giving of a Law
 “ to his People by one to be raised up
 “ among themselves, and not merely to a
 “ *Succession of Prophets*, about which the
 “ People were in no Distress.” This, added
 to the manner of Expression in which
 there is as full a Designation of one particular Prophet as Words can well give, h “ The
 “ Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a

s Sixth Discourse, p. 169, 170.

h Verse 15.

Prophet from the Midst of thee, of thy Brethren, like unto me, unto him ye shall hearken," can leave no Doubt with an unprejudiced Mind, whether it is *one Propbet, the Mediator of a new Covenant, and a new Legislator*; that is by the Words themselves design'd, or a *Succession of occasional Propbets*; and indeed all the Reason for understanding these Words of such a Succession against the plain *Letter* of the Promise, and the *Occasion* of it, lies in the Connexion it has with the Verse immediately preceding, and the 20th Verse, where occasional Prophecy, rather than a new Law, seems at first View to be intended; but a closer Attention to that Connexion will, if I mistake not, reconcile it to what the *Expression* of the Promise, and the *Occasion* of it, evidently import.

Those who refer these Words to occasional Prophecy, do it on the supposed Connexion of the Promise with the *Observers of Times*, and *Diviners*, in the preceding Verse, "which they were not to hearken unto;" but this Verse is but a Part of the Subject treated from the 9th to the 15th Verse, the idolatrous Practices of those Nations who inhabited

O

bited the Land given unto *Israel*, which as the making their Sons and their Daughters to pass thro' the Fire, and the several Species of Divination and Inchantment there enumerated; all which were but Parts of the same Idolatry, and derived all their Credit from the supposed Communication from those Deities, who, thro' the idolatrous Rites of each of them, were consulted, and which, in proportion to the Authority which these Divinations had on the Minds of People, gave as much Credit to the idolatrous Religion as they received from it. The consulting therefore of these, as it was a Seducement immediately to idolatrous Rites, and, in consequence, to idolatrous Worship in general, and an Acknowledgement of the Idol Deity, was by all means to be restrain'd; and the more so, as Mankind in general, and more especially the *Many*, have so strong a Desire of knowing the Consequences of Measures and Events in which their Passions or imagined Interests are engaged. Now there seem to be but two Ways of doing this: Either by an Oeconomy which should gratify this Desire, without going out of the Rites of their

their own Religion; or by applying the Motives and Authority of their Religion to restrain it.

Was the former intended by such a Succession of Prophets as is understood to be promised in the Passage, such a Connexion is undoubtedly most natural; but that it was intended thereby to gratify this Desire of every Particular, or to descend lower than Interests of State, or publick Concerns, or even that such an Intention is worthy God, nobody will, I presume, assert. Now if the Promise, which is supposed to be of a *public* Nature, does not correspond to the Prohibition of consulting the several Kinds of Diviners and Inchanters before-mentioned, which is plainly of a *private*, why must it be referred to it? "There shall not be found *any one* among you," who shall have recourse to Divination, because *every one* among you may to the Prophets in his Time, is a Connexion that carries Evidence with it; but 'tis none to say, *No one* in his private Capacity shall consult *Diviners*, because I will provide you *Prophets* whom you *All* together, in your public, may. There is by such an Oeconomy no Provision made for gratifying

Q 1

ing the Desire of Particulars in this respect.

Let us see, then, if this of *gratifying* be not, whether the other Way, that of *restraining* in Particulars the Desire of knowing what lies hid in the Womb of Futurity, be taken. Now this we shall find to be really the Case; and that not only the Authority of Religion, but Motives of Interest, are urged in order thereto: ⁱ "For all these Things are an
" Abomination unto the Lord; and be-
" cause of these Abominations, the Lord
" thy God doth drive them out from before
" thee." They are then reminded of their *Covenant* with God, and the Prohibitions being derived from that Covenant: ^k "Thou
" shalt be perfect," upright or sincere,
" with the Lord thy God;" and ^l "the Lord
" thy God hath not suffered thee so to do." The Obligation to the Observance of all the Commands of which Covenant, and of all its Worship, and all its Rites, without deviating into the Worship and Rites of other Nations, will remain, till ^m "The
" Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a
" Prophet, from the midst of thee, of thy
" Brethren," and not from the Heathen,

ⁱ Verse 12. ^k Verse 13. ^l Verse 14. ^m Ver. 15.

" like

" *like unto me,*" who shall be the Mediator of that new Covenant between God and you, that *everlasting* Covenant, to which none shall succeed, as I was of that *in Horeb*; and who shall prove his Mission, as I have done, by the Miracles he shall work: "To whom he shall intimately communicate himself, as he did to me, *whom the Lord knew Face to Face*: Whatsoever new Laws he shall injoin, whatsoever Alteration in your Worship and Rites he shall make, "unto him shall ye hearken:" For this is that other Prophet, "into whose "Mouth" God then in *Horeb* promised you, "He would put his Words, and "that he should speak unto you all that "he should command him," at the time when ye desired of the Lord your God, that ye might not *bear again the Voice of God himself*, and *see the Proofs of its being God* that spake to you in *that great & Fire, in all the great Terror which I shewed in the Sight of all Israel*; and when he threatened you, that "whosoever would not hearken unto "his Word, which that Prophet should

^a Chap. ult. ver. 10.

^o Chap. xviii. ver. 18.

^p Ver. 16.

^a Chap. ult. ver. ult.

^r Chap. xviii. 19.

" speak

" speak in his Name, he would require it
 " of you : " But who, on the other hand,
 told you, " That the Prophet which
 " should presume " not only to be *this* Pro-
 phet, but " to speak a Word, " any Word,
 " in *his* Name, which he had not com-
 " manded him to speak, or that should
 " speak in the Name of *other* Gods, even
 " that Prophet should die. " Should the
 latter in the Name of those Gods : " give
 " you a Sign, or a Wonder, and the Sign, or
 " the Wonder, whereof he spake unto you,
 " saying, Let us go after other Gods, should
 " come to pass, he shall, notwithstanding,
 " according to the Command just delivered
 " to you, be put to Death. " But in the
 former Case, when a Prophet speaketh in
the Name of the Lord, if he pretends to be
that Prophet like unto me, Disobediencē to
 whom the Lord has thus threatened to pu-
 nish ; nay, should he speak *any* Word in
 my Name ; 'tis to the Sign, and the Wonder,
 which he shall give to prove his Mission,

Verſe 30.

Chap. xiii. ver. 19.

v. B. ver. 3.

you

you are to look, to "know the Word
 " which the Lord hath *not* spoken," from
 the Word which he *has* : " And if the Thing
 " follow not, nor come to pass, that is,
 " the Thing which the Lord hath *not*
 " spoken, but the Prophet hath spoken it
 " presumptuously, thou shalt not be afraid
 " of him," afraid of not hearkening unto
 the Words which he shall speak, tho' he
 menace thee with God's requiring it of thee
 according to the Denunciation at *Horeb* ;
 but thou shalt put him to Death, as now
 commanded, as well as the Prophet that
 shall speak in the Name of other Gods ; both
 alike shall die.

If then the Connexion, in this View,
 with what goes before, and follows the Pro-
 phesy itself, be consistent with it, under-
 stood of Christ *primarily*, the Necessity for in-
 troducing a double Prophecy ceases, and we see
 it uniformly thro' all the Parts predictive of
 a new *Dispensation*, and a new *Mediator* or
Minister of it, and not of a Succession of
 occasional Prophets. Indeed the only Dif-
 ference between this Explication of the Pas-
 sage in *Numbers*, and that which supposes
 all

all future occasional Prophets to be confin'd to the Vision and the Dream, when applied to this Prophecy in *Deuteronomy*, lies in this ; that the peculiar Likeness between *Moses* and *Christ*, with respect to the intimate Communication from God, is by one placed in a different *Species* of Prophecy ; by the other, in a different manner in the same *Species*.

The Expression, *like unto me*, is in itself as indefinite as Likeness is, which may be in a Variety of Respects : What particular Likeness is here intended, can only be limited by the Context ; and 'tis certain that Likeness, in a new revealed Legislation — in an intimate Communication with God — in a Proof of such Mission by Miracles, is what rises out of this Prophecy, and the Likeness mentioned in the last Chapter of the Book of *Deuteronomy*, compared together. I doubt not but a Likeness peculiar to *Moses* and *Christ* may be found out in many other respects. Many may be seen in *Eusebius*, many more in the learned Mr. *For-*

^w Dem. Evan. l. 3. p. 59. Ed. Ste. 1644.

^x Rem. on Ecc. Hist. p. 203, &c.

ten ; but the Business with regard to this Prophecy, for the Sake of which the Imagination has been stretched, seems to be *what* Likeness is here intended. I shall only add, that a Likeness with respect to a *Species* of Prophecy, superior to those vouchsafed to all other Prophets, is not to be found in *Eusebius*.

F I N I S.

E R R A T A.

PAGE 7. l. 18. for a Colon, read a Comma ; p. 10. l. penult. dele the Comma ; p. 35. in the Note, for 36, read 33. p. 36. l. 14. for *attended*, read *intended* ; p. 61. l. 24. for 9. read 39. p. 92. l. ult. after allow'd, insert , and ; p. 93. l. 1. for *Manner* read *Manners* ; ib. l. 16. for *Undulation* read *Undulations* ; ib. l. ult. for a Semicolon read a Comma ; p. 94. in the first Line of the Note, for *Josbua, and from*, read *Josbua from* ; p. 96. l. 9. for *that*, read *thus* ; p. 97. l. 14. dele the Semicolon ; ib. l. 15. after *Gospel for*, read a Semi-colon ; p. 111. l. 21. for *Chapter*, read *Epistle* ; p. 112. l. 9. for *means*, read *mean* ; p. 115. in the Note, l. 9. for 2 *Cor.* read 1 *Cor.* ib. l. 12. for 38, read 13. p. 119. l. 17. after *preceding*, insert a Comma ; p. 126. l. 15. after *from*, insert *the* ; p. 138. l. 8. for *in*, read *on* ; p. 144. l. 2. for *it seems to me, to*, read *seems to me to*.

was but the Builders with regard to this
Prophecy, for the sake of which the In-
gination has been checked, seems to be
what Likeness is here intended. I shall
only add, that a Likeness with respect to a
degrees of Prophecy, superior to those vouch-
ered to all other Prophets, is not to be
found in any.

F I W I S

E R R A T A

Page 7. l. 18. for a Colon, read a Comma; p. 10.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 2. in the Note, for
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 14. for the Comma; p. 15.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 16. for the Comma; p. 17.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 18. for the Comma; p. 19.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 20. for the Comma; p. 21.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 22. for the Comma; p. 23.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 24. for the Comma; p. 25.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 26. for the Comma; p. 27.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 28. for the Comma; p. 29.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 30. for the Comma; p. 31.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 32. for the Comma; p. 33.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 34. for the Comma; p. 35.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 36. for the Comma; p. 37.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 38. for the Comma; p. 39.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 40. for the Comma; p. 41.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 42. for the Comma; p. 43.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 44. for the Comma; p. 45.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 46. for the Comma; p. 47.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 48. for the Comma; p. 49.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 50. for the Comma; p. 51.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 52. for the Comma; p. 53.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 54. for the Comma; p. 55.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 56. for the Comma; p. 57.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 58. for the Comma; p. 59.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 60. for the Comma; p. 61.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 62. for the Comma; p. 63.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 64. for the Comma; p. 65.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 66. for the Comma; p. 67.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 68. for the Comma; p. 69.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 70. for the Comma; p. 71.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 72. for the Comma; p. 73.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 74. for the Comma; p. 75.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 76. for the Comma; p. 77.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 78. for the Comma; p. 79.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 80. for the Comma; p. 81.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 82. for the Comma; p. 83.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 84. for the Comma; p. 85.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 86. for the Comma; p. 87.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 88. for the Comma; p. 89.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 90. for the Comma; p. 91.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 92. for the Comma; p. 93.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 94. for the Comma; p. 95.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 96. for the Comma; p. 97.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 98. for the Comma; p. 99.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 100. for the Comma; p. 101.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 102. for the Comma; p. 103.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 104. for the Comma; p. 105.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 106. for the Comma; p. 107.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 108. for the Comma; p. 109.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 110. for the Comma; p. 111.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 112. for the Comma; p. 113.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 114. for the Comma; p. 115.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 116. for the Comma; p. 117.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 118. for the Comma; p. 119.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 120. for the Comma; p. 121.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 122. for the Comma; p. 123.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 124. for the Comma; p. 125.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 126. for the Comma; p. 127.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 128. for the Comma; p. 129.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 130. for the Comma; p. 131.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 132. for the Comma; p. 133.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 134. for the Comma; p. 135.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 136. for the Comma; p. 137.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 138. for the Comma; p. 139.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 140. for the Comma; p. 141.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 142. for the Comma; p. 143.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 144. for the Comma; p. 145.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 146. for the Comma; p. 147.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 148. for the Comma; p. 149.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 150. for the Comma; p. 151.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 152. for the Comma; p. 153.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 154. for the Comma; p. 155.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 156. for the Comma; p. 157.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 158. for the Comma; p. 159.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 160. for the Comma; p. 161.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 162. for the Comma; p. 163.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 164. for the Comma; p. 165.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 166. for the Comma; p. 167.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 168. for the Comma; p. 169.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 170. for the Comma; p. 171.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 172. for the Comma; p. 173.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 174. for the Comma; p. 175.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 176. for the Comma; p. 177.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 178. for the Comma; p. 179.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 180. for the Comma; p. 181.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 182. for the Comma; p. 183.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 184. for the Comma; p. 185.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 186. for the Comma; p. 187.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 188. for the Comma; p. 189.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 190. for the Comma; p. 191.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 192. for the Comma; p. 193.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 194. for the Comma; p. 195.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 196. for the Comma; p. 197.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 198. for the Comma; p. 199.
l. 1. for the Comma; p. 200. for the Comma; p. 201.

Pr
in
on
to
to

I